

FEB 18 1918.

UNIV. OF MICH.

The Classical Journal

PUBLISHED BY THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE MIDDLE WEST AND SOUTH
WITH THE CO-OPERATION OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND
AND THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE PACIFIC STATES

Volume XIII

FEBRUARY 1918

Number 5

Editorial

305

Dumnorix, A Play

Max Radin 314

Does the Style of the Civil War Justify the Doubt as to Its Authenticity?

Miriam Greene Paslay 343

Analysis and Interpretation of Conditional Statements

R. B. Steele 354

A Year—or More—of Greek

Clyde Pharr 364

Notes

The Envy of the Gods in Homer

John A. Scott 372

Lincoln and Gorgias Again

N. W. DeWitt 373

Mr. Elmore's Three Passages of Tacitus' *Agricola*

N. W. DeWitt 373

Quotations from the Bible in Roman Literature

Charles N. Smiley 374

General Comment

375

Book Reviews

379

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology (Howes); *The Religious Thought of the Greeks*, Moore (Laing); *Senators as Jurors—A Correction* (Husband).

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, LONDON AND EDINBURGH

THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO,

FUKUOKA, SENDAI

THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY, SHANGHAI

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Published by the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, with the co-operation
of the Classical Association of New England and the Classical Association
of the Pacific States

Managing Editors

FRANK J. MILLER
University of Chicago

ARTHUR T. WALKER
University of Kansas

For New England

MONROE N. WETMORE
Williams College

For the Pacific States

HERBERT C. NUTTING
University of California

Associate Editors

GEORGE H. CHASE
Harvard University

FREDERICK C. EASTMAN
University of Iowa

CLARENCE W. GLEASON
Roxbury Latin School, Boston

DANIEL W. LOTHMAN
East High School, Cleveland

WALTER MILLER
University of Missouri

JOHN A. SCOTT
Northwestern University

GILBERT C. SCOGGIN
University of Missouri

JULIANNE A. ROLLER
Franklin High School, Portland, Oregon

BERTHA GREEN
Hollywood High School, Los Angeles

The Classical Journal is published monthly except in July, August, and September. The subscription price is \$2.50 per year; the price of single copies is 30 cents. Orders for service of less than a half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoan Islands, Shanghai. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$2.65); on single copies 2 cents (total 32 cents). For all other countries in the Postal Union, 24 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$2.74); on single copies 3 cents (total, 33 cents). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to The University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following are authorized to quote the prices indicated:

For the British Empire: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, 11s. 3d. each; single copies, including postage, 1s. 4d. each.

For Japan and Korea: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, 11 to 16 Nihonbashi Tori Sanchome, Tokyo, Japan. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, Yen 5.50 each; single copies, including postage, Yen 0.66 each.

For China: THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY, 18 Peking Road, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions \$2.50; single copies 30 cents, or their equivalents in Chinese money. Postage extra, if mailed direct outside of Shanghai, on yearly subscriptions 24 cents, on single copies 3 cents.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit. Deliveries are not guaranteed within the war zones of Europe nor in other countries where transportation is disturbed by conditions incident to war.

Business correspondence should be addressed as follows:

1. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of the Middle West and South to LOUIS E. LOAN, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio. The territory of the Association includes Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

2. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of New England, to GEORGE E. HOWES, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

3. Concerning membership in the Classical Association of the Pacific States to M. E. DEURACK, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. The territory of this association includes California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and Arizona. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year to residents of this territory.

4. Concerning subscriptions (not related to membership) to THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts should be sent either to FRANK J. MILLER, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., or to ARTHUR T. WALKER, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan.; from New England contributors to MONROE N. WETMORE, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., and from the Pacific States to HERBERT C. NUTTING, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.

Fifty reprints of articles will be furnished gratis to authors. Additional copies, if ordered in advance of publication, will be supplied at cost.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME XIII

FEBRUARY 1918

NUMBER 5

Editorial

THE FORTY-NINTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

This meeting of the Association was held at the University of Pennsylvania, in conjunction with the Archaeological Institute of America, December 27-29, 1917. Many other learned societies met at the same time and place, the number of these being fourteen, according to the best authorities obtainable. The writer was not aware before that so many learned societies existed in our country, but at this meeting he did learn the names of several previously unknown to him. This gathering of so many clans had both its advantages and its disadvantages. It was delightful to meet men distinguished in other departments, for a really good classical scholar is *not* narrow. He may possess little technical knowledge of economics, agriculture, etc., but he does, especially in these latter days, appreciate thoroughly the high value of these subjects. The chief disadvantage arising from this *convivium* of so many learned societies was that one could not feel that all the persons in any room at our various places of entertainment were devoted to his own especial line of work. In fact, we knew they were not all so devoted, and this kept us from becoming personally acquainted with quite the usual number of our colleagues from near or far. Members of our Association were present from all parts of the United States, from California, as well as from Pennsylvania, and also from Canada. The total number registered was about 175—nearly as

large as our highest registration in other years, and particularly noticeable in this year on account of the general conditions prevailing throughout the country and the discouragements to "unnecessary" travel advertised by the railroads. I know that one professor, who has most strenuously devoted himself to war work during the last six months, attended the meeting in order to secure a bit of relief from his arduous duties. Many others may have come for similar reasons.

Judged by previous standards, or by any high standards, it was an excellent meeting. The papers presented were widely varied in subject-matter and scholarly according to the best traditions of the Association. A few did not aim to show any depth of research, but they were brilliantly written and exciting. As usual, most of them will be published in the various classical periodicals, or in the Association's own annual volume. No outline of the papers is possible or wanted in this place. To select a few for notice here would surely lead to "invidious comparisons," while to give brief summaries of all would more than fill a whole number of the *Journal*. Therefore we must be content with the characterization of the papers given above. It should also be stated that discussions prevailed quite generally after most of the papers. At times the President felt obliged to suggest that, in view of the lateness of the hour and the fact that several more papers were to be read, it might be well to limit the discussion; but on no occasion did he peremptorily bring it to a close. Apparently everyone who wished to make a remark or to ask a question about a paper was allowed the privilege. The discussion of one paper was very spirited, to put it mildly.

Many of the papers had been most carefully designed by their authors to occupy exactly twenty minutes, the time allowance always fixed by the executive committee, and with good reason. On the other hand, some ran far overtime and finally had to be stopped by the kindly hint of the President, leaving the bulk of the manuscript unread. This is a matter that should be thoughtfully considered by everyone to whom is given a place on the programs of our various organizations. We should remember that programs, like the railroad terminals, are always bound to be congested, that

there are others due to speak after we have finished, and that the audience may not regard our subject as important as we do. Of course we may happen to have assigned to us the last place on the schedule for the session, but in this case the audience, being human, will probably be thinking more about luncheon or dinner than about our pet theories. The president does not enjoy telling a speaker that his time is up, and the disagreeable duty ought not to be forced upon him.

At this point I should like to add a suggestion made to me in a private conversation by one of our most eminent members. His belief is that the value of set, formal papers is not so very great. If the paper is really scholarly and deep, one cannot grasp all of its meaning by simply hearing it. To get the full meaning, one must *read* the paper, some parts of it probably more than once, and look up the references. Moreover, most of these papers are to be published and would be published, even if they were not delivered at our meetings. The suggestion is that we should have at each meeting one or two sessions during which no paper should be read. The session should, if possible, be held in a room provided with comfortable chairs, and one or two members might be asked to give brief *talks*, leading to general discussions. The subjects of these talks might be as various as those of our regular papers, and the discussions should be unlimited and absolutely informal. It was also specified that smoking should be allowed.

It may be of interest to give the titles of the papers read on the first day, for they were certainly most skilfully planned to be appropriate at this particular period of the world's history. "The Cosmopolitanism of the Religion of Tarsus and Origin of Mithra," by Professor A. L. Frothingham, Princeton University; "Oriental Imperialism," by Professor A. L. Olmstead, University of Illinois; "Greek Imperialism," by Professor W. S. Ferguson, Harvard University; "Roman Imperialism," by Professor G. W. Botsford, Columbia University; "The Decay of Nationalism under the Roman Empire," by Professor Clifford H. Moore, Harvard University. Professor Botsford died just two weeks before the meeting, but his paper, practically completed, was found on his desk, and it was read by one of his pupils.

Although this reads like a war-time program, references to recent events, while sometimes made and very clever, were few. The papers were all excellent and each gave a fine résumé of its subject, but for the most part they might all have been delivered in 1913. At the evening session of this first day our president, Professor Frank Gardner Moore, delivered the annual address and chose for his subject "Internationalism and the Latin Question." It was an able and interesting address and written in charming style.

Perhaps I may also be allowed to mention in particular one paper of a character different from all the others. I refer to "How the Italians Are Protecting Their Monuments," by Professor Charles Upson Clark, of The American Academy in Rome. Professor Clark exhibited a great number of pictures, showing many works of art, some of them of vast size, in the process of being protected by stagings and sand bags, and then the completed camouflage. We had heard before that much had been done along this line, but at least some of us did not know to what extent and at what tremendous expense the idea had been put into effect. The pictures were fine, and so was the description of them.

Everything possible for our comfort and entertainment was done by the University of Pennsylvania. All fourteen of the learned societies, if there really were so many, were entertained at a luncheon on Friday and also at a dinner and a smoker on the same day. On these two occasions the gymnasium, where the events occurred, was fairly well thronged; so far as we could see, however, there was no food shortage in Philadelphia.

On Thursday evening the Pennsylvania Society of the Archaeological Institute of America gave an enjoyable reception to the two associations in which we are most interested, in the gallery of the Art Club. A finer place for a reception could not be desired. The reception was largely attended with pleasure and profit for all who availed themselves of this opportunity.

Our gratitude was also due, and gladly given, to the University Club, which extended to us the privileges of their clubhouse during our stay in the city.

The Association has received a cordial invitation to meet at Columbia University, December 26-28, 1918. Will there be any meeting next year? There was some discussion of this question

at the business session on Saturday morning, and the whole question in regard to the date and place of our next meeting was referred to the Executive Committee, with power. If the war continues throughout 1918, as it almost surely will, the government may forbid travel for such purposes. Even if the government does not take this action, the Committee may deem it not advisable for us to meet again during the war. This explains why, contrary to the custom of the times, the name of our next year's meeting-place is printed out in full! There may not be any meeting, so that this information will be of no military value to the enemy.

Wherever and whenever our next meeting is held, it will naturally, judging from the heading of this editorial, be the fiftieth annual meeting of the Association. The fiftieth anniversary will, however, occur at our fifty-first annual meeting because two "annual" meetings were held in the first year of the Association's history.

The officers elected for the coming year, or until we meet again, were as follows: President, Professor Frank Frost Abbott, Princeton University; Vice-Presidents, Professor John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Professor Walter B. McDaniel, University of Pennsylvania; Secretary and Treasurer, Professor Clarence P. Bill, Western Reserve University; Executive Committee, the above-named officers, and Professor Campbell Bonner, University of Michigan, Professor Grace Harriet Macurdy, Vassar College, Professor Francis G. Allinson, Brown University, Professor Richard M. Gummere, Haverford College, Professor Henry R. Fairclough, Leland Stanford Junior University. The new member of the Nominating Committee is Professor Thomas Dwight Goodell, Yale University.

M. N. W.

[At a recent meeting of the Connecticut Section of the Classical Association of New England, the following paper by Dr. Josiah Bridge, of the Westminster School, was read. It is a ringing protest and argument against the abandonment by many colleges of the immemorial distinctive character of the Bachelor of Arts degree. The protest is timely, and we are glad to give it all possible prominence.—EDITOR.]

THE STUPIDEST OF LOSSES¹

"Since all progress of mind," writes Pater, "consists for the most part in differentiation, in the resolution of an obscure and

¹ To avoid a natural but wrong impression, the writer prefixed to this paper when read a word of caution. This paper contains no unfavorable criticism of the classical

complex object into its component aspects, it is surely the stupidest of losses to confuse things which right reason has put asunder—to lose the sense of achieved distinctions."

The object of this paper is to raise the question whether most of our American colleges have not been guilty of this very crime against truth—of confusing things which experience and right reason have plainly put asunder—while a glorious few are still unflinchingly maintaining the distinction; and, if it prove true that champions of the truth in this gathering are implicated in that stupidest of losses, to raise the further question whether the representatives of Connecticut colleges here assembled cannot concertedly take some action to help repair the damage.

Just about a third of a century, that is, a generation, ago, during the Harvard Commencement season, a Harvard alumnus delivered a Phi Beta Kappa oration entitled "A College Fetish," in which he attacked the condition then prevailing, that Greek be required for the Bachelor of Arts degree. At that time two Harvard Juniors, destined the following year to take highest final honors in classics, justly proud of the strong Greek department under Goodwin, Allen, and White, made light of the assault. One maintained that no attack on Greek distressed him a whit; it was wholly a question of survival of the fittest; and Greek would prevail on its own merits or fade from lack. The other claimed that if Harvard by any turn of fortune's wheel every dropped Greek from her course she would thereby inevitably dethrone herself from primacy among American colleges.

Three years after Mr. Adams' address the president of Harvard announced in his annual report that the long discussion of the requirements for admission to Harvard College was brought to a fortunate conclusion by the adoption of a plan by the corporation

department at Harvard. On the contrary, the writer believes that Harvard standards in classics are maintained by a corps of instructors the peer of any in her history, and unsurpassed in any college in the land. The argument is not that by giving up the requirement of Greek a college thereby weakens the quality of work in her classical department; it is that any college which allows a substitute for Greek in the Arts course, by this very undervaluation naturally lowers the reverence of the student body for that subject and creates a condition which may lead even well-informed friends of that college to measure her progress in classics unfavorably when compared with a college which does not allow such a substitute.—J. B.]

and Board of Overseers, almost unanimously recommended by the college faculty, by which Greek was no longer required for the Harvard Bachelor of Arts degree.

Let us have no obscuring of the issue here. It is not a question of the elective system, by which freer choice was given the pupil to complete his college course. That choice could have been granted and an appropriate degree given for the work done. It was lending the immense influence of Harvard to a redefinition of the meaning of the Bachelor of Arts degree. It was a statement by Harvard that in her estimation a course without Greek was equivalent to a course with Greek. It was confusing things which right reason had put asunder, and by losing the sense of achieved distinctions resulted in the stupidest of losses. For it largely drove out the gold that had stood the test of time by the free coinage of other metals. Furthermore, it has resulted in a long step toward the goal of Harvard's dethronement, foreseen as a possibility by the Harvard undergraduate in '83.

Are these exaggerated statements? A study of the Harvard president's reports makes sad reading for a humanist. In the early eighties from 210 to 250 Freshmen were studying Greek. In '84 the number dropped by just about one-half. Obviously, Freshman Greek was an elective that year. There follow a few years of slight increase or decrease till in '91 there was a sudden drop from 125 to 86. Next year an extra Freshman Greek course was given, and new enthusiasm generated, and for six years the numbers were kept above the hundred mark. Then another decline set in, not stayed by the fact that in '99 Harvard started a beginners' class in Greek. In that year, if my figures are correct, 73 Freshmen were taking Greek, one of whom was a beginner. By the last president's report there were just 42 Freshmen in the Greek classes, of whom 13 were beginners. That is some of the fruit that Harvard is reaping.

I wonder if the Harvard undergraduate today looks with the same reverent pride on her Greek department as we did in the early eighties? I cannot answer that question from direct knowledge, but I have this testimony to offer you from worthy Harvard postgraduates willing to be quoted, that in their estimation Harvard already is being passed in the race. At the last meeting at New Haven of the New England Classical Association two Harvard

Doctors in classical philology, both younger than myself, told me that when they took their degrees the Harvard graduate department was undoubtedly at the head of all American universities in the field of classics; but now two universities had outstripped her. And the two they named were the two large colleges that still require Greek for the Bachelor of Arts degree. Whether the facts were as they stated is not the point here; enough that two loyal sons of Harvard were convinced that they were stating facts.

So far, then, Harvard's redefinition of the meaning of the Bachelor of Arts degree has been followed by an appalling decrease in the number taking Greek in a greatly increased student body, and by a conviction on the part of some of her graduates in a position to know that the leadership in classics has passed from her to other colleges still requiring Greek. If Harvard has sinned and is reaping the fruits of her error, she is not the only offender. Every college that has followed in her wake, with her example as a warning, is at least an equal culprit. How painful to read in the Yale catalogue of 1903, "In 1904 and thereafter *equivalents* will be accepted for the above requirements in Greek." By what scales did Yale weigh her courses to show any subject the *equivalent* of Greek? No sadder delusion has ever enthralled the educational world than that which has seemingly led some to believe that all subjects are created equal. Here, at least, we know that without Greek we should be inestimably poorer, and no equivalent could be found to compensate for the loss.

It was the year of her two hundred and fiftieth birthday that Harvard made the grand refusal. Her ears were deaf to her own prophet, her orator at that birthday celebration, who then warned her against following any so-called "Spirit of the Age," which, if docked of his capitals, might prove a lying spirit, prone to land us in the mire at last. "Let the humanities," he urged, "be maintained undiminished in their ancient right. Leave in their traditional pre-eminence those arts that were rightly called liberal; those studies that kindle the imagination and through it irradiate the reason; those studies that manumitted the modern mind; those in which the brains of finest temper have found alike their stimulus and their repose, taught by them that the power of intellect is heightened in proportion as it is made gracious by

measure and symmetry." After this lapse of a generation, how wholesome to read side by side the oration of Adams, voicing the spirit of the age, and that of Lowell, speaking for all time. Do they not inevitably call up the catalogue of minds made by the poet of the day, "One story intellects, two story intellects, three story intellects with skylight"? In the presence of her three-story intellect with skylight, Harvard chose to follow the two-story intellects with skylight sadly lacking.

For do not these words of Lowell ring eternally true? "On a map of the world you may cover Judea with your thumb, Athens with a finger-tip, and neither of them figures in the Prices Current. But they still lord it in the thought and action of every civilized man." Herein is the kernel of the whole matter. The American schoolboys and girls are entitled to an opportunity to enter into their intellectual and spiritual inheritance. Our colleges, by their change of front, have driven Greek from most of the public schools, and so have debarred many from their birthright. What are you going to do to repair the damage? Say, as the president of one great college has said, "It is not my fault"? But by admitting its existence, yet not doing all in your power to remove the fault, it *is* your fault. Why not defy all the lying spirits of the age, and join Princeton and Chicago in their three-degree plan; saying that no student shall obtain the Bachelor of Arts degree without satisfactory first-hand acquaintance with the language and literature of Greece as well as of Rome? Not till then will you do your plain duty to the American scholar in helping him to his birthright.

And what a birthright!

From what a far antiquity, my soul,
Thou drawest thy urn of light! What other one
Of royal seed,—yea, children of the sun,—
Doth so divinely feel his lineage roll
From the full height of man? The immortal scroll
Of thy engendering doth from Plato run,
Colonnos singing, Simois, Marathon!
Into thy birth such secret glory stole.
The kings of thought, and lords of chivalry
Knighted me in great ages long ago:
From David's throne, and lowly Galilee
And Siloa's brook, my noble titles flow.
Under thy banner, Love, devout and free,
Storing all time, thy child I come and go.

**DUMNORIX, A PLAY
FABULA BRACCATA**

BY MAX RADIN
Newtown High School, New York City

PERSONAE

Galli

CASTICUS, Sequanus
EPORIX, Aeduus
RATISSA, Aedua, uxor DUMNORIGIS
SANIA, Aedua
DUMNORIX, Aeduus
DIVICIACUS, Aeduus
BUSTUCCUS, Belga
GERDO, Arvernus
ANUS
SERVI. MILITES

Romani

P. VERGINIUS RUFUS, tribunus
A. TREBATIUS TESTA
D. IUNIUS BRUTUS, tribunus
C. HERENNIUS, tribunus
C. IULIUS CAESAR, imperator
A. CAESENNIUS, centurio
OPTIO
STROBILUS, servus
THYRSUS, servus
SERVI. MILITES

SCAENA

ACTUS PRIMUS, Bibracte
ACTUS SECUNDUS, Ad Portum Itium
ACTUS TERTIUS, *Ibidem*

ACTUS PRIMUS

(*The scene is a courtyard in the house of Dumnorix near Bibracte. A gate leads to an outer yard protected by a stockade fence. In back is the house. Slaves are passing in and out from the courtyard into the house. Casticus and Eporix are discovered on the stage.*)

Casticus: Nunc autem ubi est?

Eporix: Quem dicas? Diviciacum? Ut semper, apud Caesarem.

Cast.: Nulla ergo ex eo spes?

Ep.: Nulla. Nec mirum. Qualis quantusque esset iste noster princeps nisi Romanis dominantibus! Amicus est, familiaris Caesaris. Di boni! Honor egregius, eximia laus, cum regis filius regumque nepos amicus appellatur advenae cuiusdam Italici!

Cast.: Qui auro corrumptur, lucrum saltem facit. Quid ille adsequitur qui se vanis verbis vendit?

Ep.: Gratiam apud hostes. Sed mihi crede, Castice, si illa die, quam tu memoria tenere debes, puncto temporis serius advenisset Dumnorix, non nunc quereremur Diviciacum, Diviciaci filium, proditorem patriae, Romanorum adsensorem.

Cast.: Quamquam, si sica tua tunc interemptus esset, alias extitisset Diviciaci similis.

Ep.: Alius sed non Diviciacus. Ignoras scilicet quid apud nos nomen valeat. Vergobretum habemus stultum, principem civitatis perfidum. Sine his autem nominibus prorsus imbecilles sumus. Quae si aliter forent, nunc nunc tempus esset Galliae liberandae.

Cast.: Vera dicas. Nunc tempus adest diu speratum.

Ep.: Et nos id loquendo conterimus. Utinam qui paternum nomen usurpat, animum paternum accepisset! aut qui animo maior est natu, ille et aetate antecederet!

Cast.: Quis non eadem faceret vota? Si Gallos rogabis, omnes eadem dicent. Dumnorigem esse quem, quamvis annis minorem, principem oporteat appellari Aeduorum.

Ep.: Scio. Haec causa est cur sperare nondum desierim.

Cast.: Numquid et Dumnorix sperat?

Ep.: Sperat quidem. Fortasse etiam cogitat.

Cast.: Quid tandem cessat? Is vir est cuius manus consilio numquam deesse solita sit.

Ep.: Suspectus est Caesari. Custodiunt eum multi Romani et—pudet confiteri—Aedui. Nihil agit quod non statim Caesari nuntietur. Sed si paucos dies exspectare vis—

(*Ratissa comes from the house.*)

Ratissa: Salvere iubeo.

Ep., Cast.: Et tu salve, mulier.

Ratissa (to Eporix): Ecquid novi de castris?

Ep.: Percontatum ipse huc adveni. Venietne Dumnorix?

Ratissa: Veniet, et mox.

Ep. (in a lower voice): Et legati Helvetiorum?

Ratissa: St! Sania domi est.

Ep.: Qualis Sania?

Ratissa: Sobrina nostra quam Romanam dicunt magis quam Aeduam.

Ep.: Scio. Videre nolo. Vale.

Cast.: Vale.

Ratissa: Valete ambo.

(*Sania comes from the house just as the two are leaving. She looks inquiringly at Ratissa.*)

Sania: Qui hi sunt?

Ratissa: Alter Aeduus alter Sequanus—amicus uterque Dumnorigis.

Sania: Me, ut videtur, vitare volebant.

Ratissa: Minime, minime. Dumnorigem salutatum abeunt.

Sania: Venit?

Ratissa: Si passus est Caesar. Nam omnia quae nunc facimus Aedui, permissu facimus Romanorum.

Sania: Dic mihi, Ratissa, ecquem umquam vidisti Romanorum?

Ratissa: Numquam. Tu autem multos iam. Nonne?

Sania: Multos.

Ratissa: Quali sunt habitu?

Sania: Homunculi deformes.

Ratissa: Quid dicas? Sed cur igitur eos tu diligis?

Sania: Egone?

Ratissa: Ita aiunt.

Sania (with bitterness): Odi eos sicut tu, sicut omnes.

Ratissa: Ego quidem non odi.

Sania: Itane? Diligis fortasse eos qui gravissimis contumeliis maritum obruerunt: qui in concilio Aeduorum eum de sella surgere iusserunt: qui tamquam fugitivum deprehensum in provinciam

ad praetorem deduxerunt. Tune oblita es qualis patris sis filia,
qualis socii nurus?

Ratissa: At aiunt fere omnes—

Sania: Scio, a Romano quondam amatam me aiunt: nec falso.

Ratissa: Sania!

Sania: Fateor. Et ego illum amavi. (*After a pause.*)
Etenim haec praecipua est causa cur oderim.

Ratissa: Idcirco odisti quia amasti?

Sania: Idcirco sane. Mendacem esse, perfidum, durum—
hoc est Romanum esse.

Ratissa (embraces her): Sania—soror! O si antea cognossem!

(*A shout is heard outside. Eporix hurriedly enters.*)

Ep.: Dumnorix adest! Dumnorix!

(*Ratissa runs to the gate. As Eporix is about to follow, Sania calls him.*)

Sania: Aeduus es—Nonne?

Ep.: Ita.

Sania: Dumnorigis amicus?

Ep.: Cliens.

Sania: Et Diviciaci?

Ep.: Inimicissimus: immo hostis. Etenim non iam est civis
meus.

Sania: Cur me suspectam habes Dumnorigis sobrinam?

Ep.: Quae inter barbarum et Romanam potest esse fides?

Sania: Iam iam te errare evincam.

(*Dumnorix, in Gallic costume, enters with Ratissa. The other two go to greet him.*)

Dumnorix: Salvete omnes!

Ep.: Salve Dumnorix! Laeta te fronte esse video.

Dum.: Quidni? Nonne laetari debet is cui ipse Caesar
favere se ostendit?

Ep.: Favetne tibi?

Dum.: Mihi quidem. Stabam enim in castris cum aliis
Aeduis, cum ipse praeteribat. Salutamus omnes. Ille resalutat
et cum me aspicit leniter arridet.

Ep.: Ceteris fortasse.

Dum.: Nullo modo. Nam illorum capita altius erant demissa quam ut oculis conspectum Caesaris petere possent. Unus ego intueri audebam.

Ep.: Haec fortasse erat causa cur arrideret—sed Romane.

Dum.: Amici—sumus amici omnes—(*To Sania.*) Ignosce, Sania, quod olim tibi diffisus sum,—diebus fortasse quattuor aut quinque, se paullulum commutaverit risus ille Romanus Gai Caesaris. Ita risit, nam bene memini legatus populi Romani cum coram civibus meis iram fratris humiliiter deprecari coactus essem. Ita risit cum iurarem fidum me fore populo Romano. Iuppiter!—nam tu vidisti ignominiam—iam et ultionem videbis.

Ep.: Quamvis brevis mora vix ferenda.

Sania: Dies igitur instat.

Dum.: Tribus post diebus frumentum metiri oportebit exercitui Romano, si adfuerit frumentum.

Sania: Aderitne? Multum multis in oppidis celatum dicitur.

Dum.: Quod celatum est nonnumquam haud facile invenitur.

Sania: At Liscus patefaciet.

Dum.: Nolet, si sapiet.

Ep.: Superior vergobretus subito, aiunt, mortuus est.

Sania: Quid si frumentum Romanis non suppeditabit?

Dum.: Vivendum est etiam militi. Deserent signa multi. Complures ordines, legio tota fortasse deficiet. Ira perturbatione clamore plena erunt castra.

Sania: At ne hoc quidem satis. Multo enim maior pars exercitus restabit a qua frustra nos defendere conabimur nisi Helvetii iter in Romanos converterint.

Ratissa: Ita est. Nisi Helvetii iter converterint.

(*A momentary silence.*)

Sania: Intellego! Facient! Convertent! Iam dudum vos id cognostis. O gratias, gratias vobis, di nostri! di Gallici! nunc ago. Audiistis enim mea vota.

Ep.: Nec Aedui sibi deērunt. Decem milia prope exspectant armatorum dum signum audiant.

Sania: Hoc unum mihi responde, Dumnorix! Si Romani—vel pauci ex eis—mortem fugerint, si comprehensi sint vivi—si Caesar—

Dum.: Vereor ne interfectum proelio se malit.

Sania: Occidentne eum Helvetii?

Dum.: Occident, sed paullo post.

Sania: Cruciatus edent?

Dum.: Nullum genus praetermittent cruciatus. Iure id quidem. Quale supplicium immerito ille feret qui per insidias nocturno impetu mulieres imbellesque pueros trucidavit?

Sania: Legati quoque?

Dum.: Et illi.

Sania: Quid tribunis fiet?

Dum.: Parcetur nemini.

Sania: Utinam adsim!

Dum.: Cui rei?

Sania: Cum tribunos in crucem agent.

Ratissa: Quid si iter Helvetii non convertant—si Liscus te metuere desinat—si aliunde sibi Caesar frumentum compareret?

Dum.: Si—si—si—Nihil umquam faciunt qui illo verbo nimium utuntur. Omnia cogitata provisa comparata tibi confirmo—nihil esse quod diligentiam nostrorum fugere potuerit. Quid amplius vis?

Sania: Desine, Ratissa mea, nimis esse prudens.

Ratissa: Patrem habui. Quotiens cogitantem vidi! quotiens meditantem! Nec cum semel consilium cepisset fieri posse existimavit ut se spes sua falleret. Sed non de vobis queror—monere tantum cupio. Audaces esse decet eos qui magna moliuntur—sociorum est praecavere.

(*A slave comes from the gate and whispers something to Dumnorix. The latter springs from his chair in unbounded amazement.*)

Ep.: Quid est? Qui adfertur nuntius?

Dum.: Diviciacus adest! Discedite. Solus cum solo agere volo.

(*Ratissa, Sania, and Eporix turn to go into the house. Dumnorix remains standing, facing the gate, as Diviciacus enters. The latter is in Roman costume, an elderly man with close-cropped hair and clean-shaven face. He wears a toga and certain military insignia.*)

Diviciacus: Salve! (*There is no answer.* *Diviciacus proceeds.*) Hospes molestus, sentio, intro fratri mei domum.

Dum.: Aedua est. Sordidius tectum quam ut amicum Caesaris excipiat.

Div.: Amicus sum Caesaris—non infitior—et tuus.

Dum.: Longe a me absit ut ausim socium me adiungere Caesari.

Div.: Nec minus quam tu sum patriae amans.

Dum.: Ipso vestitu scilicet amorem prete fers!

Div.: Vere qui amat, saluti consulit. Civis servare volo, terram a rapinis defendere. Iam vides orbem terrarum a populo Romano domitum. Num tu existimas Aeduos resistere eis posse quorum impetum coniuncti firmissimi populi non valuerint sustinere? Et in provincia et trans Alpes multae et magnae gentes sese in fidem permiserunt Romanis.

Dum.: Multi et illuc fuerunt Diviciaci.

Div.: Nec defuerunt Dumnoriges quorum si caecum consilium plus potuisset, tantum esset eis nunc reliqui quantum flamma obire non potuisset aut rapax miles neglexisset. (*His voice changes to one of expostulation.*) Mi frater, si ab Helvetiis superatus de terra nostra discesserit Caesar, num prorsus oblitus es quantum nobis impendeat periculum?

Dum.: Unde?

Div.: A tergo—ab Ariovisto.

Div.: Hoc ergo consecuti sumus. Filius illius viri quem maxime horrebat Germani, ultro Germanos timet.

Div.: Fortis es; quis neget? Quid autem proelio ad Magetobrigam nobis profuit ista vestra fortitudo?

Dum.: Consensio hostium nostram vicit discordiam.

Div.: At vicit. Quid nunc faciamus victi si iterum adoriatur Ariovistus?

Dum.: Uno post anno—

Div.: Quid si exspectare nolit? Mihi crede, frustra laborabis qui cum fatis contendes. Nunc nunc inter Germanum dominum est optandum et Romanum—inter crudelēm tyrannū et mansuetum imperatorem. Num difficilis est optio?

Dum.: Difficillima. Acerbissimis suppliciis constitutis, corpori tantum minatur Germanus, Romanus autem animo, quippe qui servitatem gratam efficiat.

Div.: Iam pridem mentem tuam novi. Sed si non tibi, coniugibus liberisque Aeduorum consule. Salus nostra cum Caesaris salute penitus implicata est. Opus illi est nunc frumento.

Dum.: Sibi sumat.

Div.: Unus Aeduorum ipse praebere potes.

Dum.: Egone?

Div.: Quis alias?

Dum.: Magistratus sunt Aedui. Munere fungantur.

Div.: Noli tergiversari. Privatus summum magistratum obtines. Quis nescit quid apud plebem possis? Scimus omnes Aedui. Scit ipse Caesar.

Dum.: Ain tu? Caesarem scire dicis? A quo certiorem factum?

Div.: Nec maiora ignorat.

Dum.: Quae maiora?

Div.: Scit Caesar quo duce equitatus in iniquum locum inciderit; scit qui primus fugere cooperit; scit qua ratione unus e proelio incolumem se eripuerit.

Dum.: Bonis utitur exploratoribus.

Div.: Oro te Dumnorix obsecroque, noli te perdere. Praesta officium tuum.

Dum.: Praestabo. I, domino renuntia me recusare postulata.

Div.: Si vocabit Caesar—

Dum.: Me reperiet ubi me esse decet—Gallorum in acie.

Div.: Nempe Helvetiorum!

Dum.: Ita. Restat vel una gens Gallica quae Romanos metuere nondum didicerit. Hac ipsa nocte profecturus sum.

Div.: At fieri potest ut ante noctem—

Dum.: Gratiam habeo. Monitum me intellego. (*Calls out into the courtyard.*) Eho Tracho! Burne! Equam comparate.

(*At the noise caused by the running of the slaves to carry out his orders Sania and Ratissa come from the house in great alarm. Dumnorix hurries to them.*)

Nolite commoveri. Eo ad castra Helvetiorum. Salvas vos
praebebit Eporix. Fortasse etiam Caesar mulieres vexare indig-
nabitur.

Ratissa: Tune nos relinquis?

Dum.: Oportet. Monet me frater carissimus ut extemplo
profinciscar nisi vi prohiberi malim.

(*There is a confused noise outside, of shout-
ing and running. Eporix enters in great
agitation.*)

Ep.: Sero agis, Dumnorix! Romani—

Dum.: Quid dicis!

Ep. (breathless): Romani—adsunt—refertum praedium—
undique tenemur circumventi.

(*Dumnorix stands still in momentary con-
sternation. Then, with a cry of fury, he
draws his sword and is about to dash out.*)

Dum.: Agedum. Vendam, non dabo eis victoriam. Iam
iam cavete, taetrae beluae!

(*Ratissa attempts to hold him. He breaks
from her and is almost at the gate when
Diviciacus puts his hand on his shoulder.*)

Div.: Sero agis, Dumnorix.

(*Dumnorix stops irresolute. Then, as the
hopelessness of his efforts becomes apparent,
he drops his sword and stands with his face
buried in his hands, sobbing. The tribune
P. Verginius Rufus opens the gate. As Sania
sees him, she gasps and retires out of sight.*)

Rufus: Heus tu Dumnorix! Vocab te Caesar.

Dum. (making a gesture of despairing submission): Praecede.
Sequor.

ACTUS SECUNDUS

(*Four years later. The camp of Caesar near Portus Itius. In the background is the tent of the tribune Decimus Brutus. A number of young officers are chatting or playing dice. Among them are Aulus Trebatius, Gaius Herennius, Publius Verginius. A young slave, Thyrsus, comes running onto the stage from the right, followed by an older one, Strobilus. At the end of the stage Thyrsus trips and falls and is immediately pounced upon by Strobilus.*)

Strobilus: Te habeo, verbero! Fur trifurcate! Cedo! Redde argentum.

Thyrsus (to officers): Auxilium mihi, viri clarissimi, oro feratis.

Verginius (without turning): Quid negoti 'st? Tu, Stobile, quid hominem pugnis enicas?

Strob. (letting Thyrsus go, who rises at once and runs to the back of the stage, Strobilus shaking his fist at him): Ego ut ei parcam! qui mihi misero peculium surripuit.

Thyr.: Ego tibi peculium! Unde partum? Aut quando tu gulae denegasti quod ex erili arca clam abstulisti?

Strob.: Quid ais? furcifer? Etiam negas?

Thyr.: Aio argentum me coegisse quod ex syngrapha iam dudum mihi debeas.

Strob.: Ex syngrapha tibi! qui ne id quidem scis acceptumne an expensum oporteat quod furatus sis, referre.

Thyr.: At tu quidem bene scis.

Strob.: Quid multis opus est verbis? In ius te voco.

Thyr.: Non eo.

Strob.: Non is! Audite, viri, hominis impudentiam. In ius vocatus, ire recusat. Nonne e lege obtorto collo trahi licet?

Trebatius: Ita lex iubet. "Si calvitur, pedemve struit—" I, macte virtute tua, obtorque collum.

Strob. (rushing at Thyrsus who dodges him): Faciam.

Verg.: Utrique tergo malum comparatur. En dominus!
(Both slaves scurry off, left, as Brutus enters, right.)

Brutus: Qui sunt hi qui currunt? Agnoscere videor.

Treb.: Familiares tui.

Brut.: Intellego. Numquid moleste fuerunt?

Treb.: Minime. Philosophice enim disceptabant.

Brut.: Qua de re? Uter esset nequior servus? Quaestio difficillima. Sed satis multa de istis. Nuntium adfero mirabilem. Favete auribus!

Verg.: Horreo exspectans. Quid est? Num Caesaris caput capillum promittere incipit?

Brut.: Certum 'st Caesar exercitum in Britanniam traduci.

Omnès (*in great excitement, to each other and to Brutus*): Quid dicit? Quo? Iterum in Britanniam? Non ibo. An insanit Caesar?

Brut.: Ita est, amici. Navibus ero praefectus ego.

Treb.: Gratulor tibi, mi Brute, quod mox inter nautas nau-seaturus es.

Brut.: Tibi ipse gratulare. Num creditis vos Caesarem relic-turum?

Verg.: Vinctosne catenis nos secum ducere in animo ei est? Nam aliter non ibo.

Herennius: Nec ego. Iuro per dextram imperatoris et eius calvissimum caput.

Verg.: O portentum! Quam non iurandum iurasti ius iuran-dum!

Treb.: Iurate, Romani. Coniurant fratres nostri Aedui.

Her.: Recte admones. Relinquenturne isti Aedui?

Brut.: Ex ipsis quaere. Advenire video Dumnorigem.

(Dumnorix joins the group from the right.

He wears complete Roman military costume.

His hair is closely cropped like that of the other officers.)

Dum.: Salvete.

Omnès: Salve, Dumnorix.

Brut.: Numquid novi?

Dum.: Nihil, nisi quae ipse scis. Fama est iterum in Britanniam navigandum.

Brut.: Quid de ea re dicunt Galli?

Dum.: Quid nostra refert? Non ex Gallorum decretis bellum a Caesare geritur.

(*The others have been laughing and chatting among themselves. Herennius nudges Trebatius, who calls out.*)

Treb.: Dumnorix, tribus te verbis volo.

Dum.: Mille, si placet.

Treb.: Nonne nuper nobis dixisti nomen tuum tua idem esse quod nostra lingua rex.

Dum.: Ita est.

Treb.: Cave igitur, sis, Bruto nimis utaris familiariter.

Dum.: Cur, quaeso?

Treb.: Fatalis gens ad reges tollendos. Hanc tu cave, Dumnorix.

Brut.: Nimis antiqua revolvis, Trebati. Non sum tam brutus Brutus qui nesciam obsoleuisse iam istam rationem regum tollendorum. Et ego philosophari scio. Solus sapiens est rex. Vinc tu, inepte, sapientiam tolli?

(*An orderly [optio] enters.*)

Optio: Redit in castra imperator.

Brut.: Eamus salutatum.

(*As the others hurry off the stage to the left, Dumnorix stands looking after them. Then he walks to the right of the tent, where he takes a seat upon a stool and remains there some time, apparently lost in thought. Several Gallic chieftains enter from the right, all in native costume. Among them are Bustuccus and Gerdo. After them, Eporix and Sania, the latter in the costume of a slave. The others seem somewhat hesitant, but Eporix walks close to Dumnorix.*)

Ep.: Dumnorix!

Dum.: Quis me appellat? Salve, Eporix. Et vos salvete, viri, qui qui estis.

Bus.: Nonne me agnoscis, Dumnorix? Patris tui hospitem?

Dum.: Nunc quidem agnosco. Salve, Bustucc!

Bus.: Salve, Dumnorix! Salve, spes Gallorum!

Dum.: Erras, hospes. Omnis Gallorum spes aliunde pendet.

Bus.: Aliunde? Qua ex re?

Dum.: Romana.

Gerdo.: Quid dicas? Tu quoque tam brevi es Romanus factus?

Dum.: Gallus sum, ut semper. Hoc tamen adfirmo: nisi per Romanos salvam rem Gallorum esse non posse.

Gerdo.: Tene id dicere!

Dum.: Dico quod sentio, quod unumquemque sentire ipse intelleges cum diutius inter Romanos versatus eris.

Gerdo.: Neququam igitur speramus omnes Galli ducem te fore liberandae patriae.

Dum. (*with a little smile*): Liber est cui animus est liber.

Gerdo (*fiercely*): Maxime servit is qui se ob servitatem consolatur.

Bus.: Illudit nobis Dumnorix. Fieri non potest ut tam superbū, tamque ferox ingenium brevissimo tempore iugum tam patienter ferre didicerit. (*Turns to Dumnorix.*) Noli socios nos contemnere, Dumnorix. Non sumus de plebe garruli curiosique senes. Apud nostros honorati ad te convenimus auxilium laboranti patriae postulatum. Te exspectamus principem, te sequi cupimus; te duce vincere confidimus.

Dum. (*after a short pause*): Frustra me tentatis. Quam fidem Romanis praestiti, inviolatam servabo. (*Rises.*) Iam discedite. Etiam plura audire flagitium esset.

(*Gerdo is about to reply, but is checked by Bustuccus. The Gauls seem irresolute. Finally they turn to go. As they reach the exit, Bustuccus turns.*)

Bus.: Imus. Di tibi ob proditionem atque ignaviam poenas dignas persolvant.

(*Sania remains behind and takes a seat at the back of the stage. Eporix remains with Dumnorix.*)

Ep.: Durior eras. Honesti viri sunt qui et te diligunt et patriam liberare ex animi sui sententia student.

Dum.: Non nego. Sed novi civis meos. Quod semel vix cogitatum sentiunt statim divulgatur, et ante ad hostium auris pervenit quam ad eos qui efficiendi partes suscepserunt.

Ep.: At consiliorum participes habere necesse est.

Dum.: Quorum satis magnam copiam habeo, at quam fidissimorum. Etiam apud Aeduos unum inveni qui et tacere possit, et cum opus sit, agere.

Ep.: Apud Aeduos? Quemnam?

Dum. (smiling): Rogas? Ipsum te.

Ep.: Ne ego quidem certo scio quid tibi sit in animo.

Dum.: Scis quantum ego ipse. Scis hoc unum a nobis expectari dum nuntii Caesarem in Britannia esse referant. Tunc eodem tempore bellum in quattuor disiunctissimis Galliae partibus movebitur; expugnabuntur hiberna; hostes concidentur.

Ep.: Sed sine te duce nihil ex eis rebus efficietur.

Dum.: Non deero. Quintum iam annum labore. Nec, ut olim, temere et confuse omnia agentur. Ab hostibus doctus arma in hostes fero. Minus Romanos timeo quam Gallos ne ab invidis adducti consilium irritum faciant.

Ep.: Quod ad Aeduos attinet nihil est quod te dubium facere possit. Quandocumque signum dabitur, parati erimus. Satis nos deceptos elusos relictos ab Romanis sentimus.

Dum.: Ceterorum litteris idem mihi nuntiatur.

Ep.: Unum doleo. Malorum nostrorum machinator nos effugiet. Cum Galliam defecisse compererit Caesar, quid eum impediet quin navibus per aestivum mare Hispaniam petat?

Dum.: Effugiat. Quid mea refert? Quin etiam si vivum comprehendero, incolumem in provinciam deducendum curabo. Non cum homine mihi res est, sed Romano. Nec iam eum odi. Occisis militibus, demersa classe, non nobis plus nocere poterit quam dentibus remotis fera.

Ep.: At habes quae tuo nomine queraris.

Dum.: Haec condono. Num solus Caesar clemens?

Sania: Pulchre omnia. Et tamen metuo.

Dum.: Scilicet ne Caesar consilia reperiatur.

Sania: Fortasse iam repperit.

Dum.: Fieri non potest. Summis honoribus me afficit.
Nemini plus confidit.

Sania: Dolosus Romanus.

Dum.: Eo facilius deceptus.

Sania: Dicunt multi omnia auxilia secum in Brittaniam traducturum Caesarem.

Dum.: Hoc tamen scio. Relinquar ego in Gallia; Caesar enim pollicitus est.

Ep.: Nec milites nec tribuni transmittere gestiunt. Brittanorum periculum anno superiore fecerunt. Sunt qui dicant non fore dicto audientem exercitum.

Dum.: Noli ita existimare. Quod iussi erunt, facient.
Utinam nostri exercitus ita ad parendum eruditii fuissent!

(*Sania has in the meanwhile gone to one side.*

Dumnorix continues in a lower tone.)

Hoc mihi responde. Quem petit Sania tribunorum?

Ep.: Verginium, ni fallor.

Dum.: Ille igitur est qui eam olim in provincia—

Ep.: Ita prorsus existimo.

Dum.: Timeo ne quando ira incitata nostrum consilium praeoccupet.

Ep.: Et ego.

Dum.: An agnovit eam Verginius?

Ep.: Non agnovit. Sania autem toto animo tempus iniuriae vindicandae exspectat. Transeundum Verginio cum Caesare, facultasque ulciscendi praetermittenda, nisi properat: idcirco properabit.

Dum.: Monenda est; sed postea. Adsunt Romani.

(*A group of Roman officers enter, who exchange greetings with Dumnorix. After a minute or so, Caesar enters with Brutus and a few other tribunes.)*

Caesar: Salve, mi Dumnorix. Fausta te hora nactus sum.

Dum.: Vin tecum colloqui?

Caes.: Volo. Venia vestra, amici, cum Dumnorige solo agere cupio.

(*All but Dumnorix and Caesar retire. Caesar takes a seat near the tent, and Dumnorix remains standing before him.*)

Dum.: Quid imperat imperator?

Caes.: Non tam imperantis quam rogantis partes hic suscipio. Scire velim an umquam in Britannia fueris.

Dum.: Numquam.

Caes.: Sed cognosti qui fuerunt.

Dum.: Paucos.

Caes.: Num maxime feros renuntiaverunt incolas esse.

Dum.: Minime. Eiusdem linguae eiusdem indolis quae Gallis.

Caes.: Sic et ego eos inveni. Unde igitur ista fama quae exercitum nunc commovet?

Dum.: Ex ignavis orta est qui timorem suum timore omnium obtegere volunt.

Caes.: Et alios rumores audivi qui maxime me perturbent: esse nonnullos qui militum animos sollicitent ne in Britanniam transeant; ipsos tribunos dicunt ire recusatueros.

Dum.: Pessime sane de suo exercitu Caesar existimat qui huius modi rumoribus credat.

Caes.: Minime credo. Sed commotum me fateor. Nisi me per viros fidissimos fortissimosque circumdatum sentirem—

Dum.: Pro Aeduis ipse loquor. Eandem laudem merita est fides Gallica quam olim fides Romana.

Caes.: Eandem. Quis negat? Timeo tamen ut omnes ista laude digni sint seu Galli seu Romani. Gallus Gallorum cognosti animum. Saepe apud te vidi quandam qui, ut puto, Eporix appellatur. Estne ille fidelis?

Dum.: Fidelissimus.

Caes.: Quidam eum mihi suspectum facere conati sunt.

Dum.: Invidi.

Caes.: Facile credo. (*A pause.*) Omnia, mi Dumnorix, tibi ostendam quae mihi sunt in animo. Vereor ne nimis sint perturbati milites mei si ad timorem Brittanorum et ille timor accesserit, ne post tergum Galli bellum moveant.

Dum.: Unde bellum oriri posse censes?

Caes.: Undique.

Dum.: Quid si exsisterit qui in fide mansuram Galliam tibi confirmet?

Caes.: Scilicet tu is eris!

Dum.: Ego.

Caes.: Magna suspicis.

Dum.: Maiora perficiam.

Caes.: Mihi autem visum est omnes quos mei suspicentur mecum deducere. Sine principibus gentes fore quietas existimant.

Dum.: Quasi obsidum loco?

Caes.: Minime. Non ego eis fidem denego. Benevolentiam enim saepe comprobavi. Hac tantum de causa id facere decrevi ut concitatos militum animos sedare possim.

Dum.: Sit ita, si tibi placet. Ego quidem triduo vel quadriduo Bibracte revertar. Ex Aeduis saltem nihil est quod vel invidissimis causam suspicionis possit praebere.

Caes.: Vereor, Dumnorix, ne invidiores sint quam credas.

Dum.: Me quoque audent calumniari!

Caes.: Quis clam audax esse metuat?

Dum.: Me igitur quoque constituisti tecum ducere?

Caes.: Qua causa illata, ceteros deducam te relicto.

Dum. (*after a pause*): Nollem recusare quod vel Caesari vel populo Romano ex usu esset; sed in Britanniam te sequi non possum.

Caes.: Cur, quaeso?

Dum.: Vetat religio.

Caes.: Qualis religio?

Dum.: Antiqua a maioribus accepta. Nullo modo ei qui certis Druidum initiatius est sacris mare transire licet.

Caes.: Et tu anilibus servis superstitionibus?

Dum.: Moremque patrium servare decet.

Caes.: Etiam istos mores quibus homines deis immolare iubemini.

Dum.: Non nunc de istis moribus agitur. Nefastis abiectis moribus, ceteros summa pietate colere oportet nisi quid ex eo detrimenti accipiat res publica.

Caes.: Nonne satis magnum tibi detrimentum id videtur quod dixi?

Dum.: Fortasse maius videtur quam est.

Caes.: Noli ita existimare. Ut tibi vera dicam, multo minus tibi communicavi quam ex militibus audivi. Sunt etiam qui quae quattuor ante annis precibus fratris tui condonavi, memoria teneant: mutatum in te nihil dicunt nisi aspectum. (*Rising.*) Volve haec tecum animo, Dumnorix. Tempus tibi dabo quod satis est, sed nullo modo fieri potest ut te hic relinquam.

(*Caesar leaves the stage. Dumnorix, with every sign of suppressed rage, sinks into the seat just vacated and remains staring fixedly ahead of him. Sania slips in quietly.*)

Sania: Quid evenit, Dumnorix? Valde commotus videris.

Dum.: Aut suspicatur Caesar aut cognovit omnia.

Sania: Quid facturus est?

Dum.: Me secum ducere decrevit.

Sania: Ibisne?

Dum.: Numquam ibo. Maturius quam constitui sed eo gravius agam.

Sania: Et ego.

Dum. (starts): Sania!

Sania: Quid me vis?

Dum.: Cave ne nimium mature.

Sania: Noli timere. An putas hoc satis fore si sica aut veneno clam eum ulciscar? Ad pedes proiectum videre volo ut vitam suppliciter eum petentem interficere possim. Nec ulla alia ratione contenta ero.

Dum.: Odisti plus quam Gallice.

Sania: A Romanis didici et amare et odisse.

(*Verginius is seen approaching. Sania hastily withdraws, but not before she is noticed by Verginius.*)

Verg.: Lepidam mehercle ancillam, Dumnorix, tecum inter arma deduxisti.

Dum.: Non mea est. Nostine Eporigem?

Verg.: Novi.

Dum.: Illius est nuper empta.

Verg.: Putasne venalem esse?

Dum.: Vin emere?

Verg.: Nisi nimio pretio. Non ego sum Crassus.

Dum.: Placet tibi illa, ut videtur.

Verg.: Placet: non infitior.

Dum.: Vocabo dominum. Sed hoc mihi responde, Vergini.

An re vera Caesar in Britanniam transmittet?

Verg.: Ita vult. Amoena, credo, insula anno superiore valde delectabat. Omnes secum ducet.

Dum.: Gratior videlicet mors inter amicos.

Verg. (quickly): Morituros nos censes?

Dum.: Omnibus aliquando moriendum.

Verg.: Sed periculum magnum esse existimas?

Dum.: Periculoso semper mare. Sed fortis periculum delectat. Quamquam non tam fortis quam temerarii animi est certam oppetere mortem.

Verg.: Furentis, si nulla necessitate coactus.

Dum.: Multae ibi feroesque gentes. E quibusdam audivi Romanum olim mercatorem vivo corpore ad quattuor indomitos equos colligatum divolsumque.

Verg.: Horribilia narras. Et cum talibus gentibus nulla provocatus iniuria, bellum gerere statuit Caesar!

Dum.: Maior a digno hoste accipienda gloria.

Verg.: Maior, non infitior. Sed soli imperatori. Quid nos consequemur qui nec imperatores sunt nec legati?

Dum.: Parendum est, cum iubet Caesar.

Verg.: Me cogere non potest. Tam sum civis Romanus quam ille. Nullo sacramento in eius verba adactus sum.

Dum.: Sed ceteri verendi tribuni. Nemo haberi vult ignavus.

Verg.: Si ego exercitum relinquam, facient idem omnes fere tribuni.

Dum.: Putasne?

Verg.: Iam diu exploratum habeo. Galliam subegimus. Cur alienae gloriae causa et mortem nobis comparemus et quam vicimus Galliam amittamus?

Dum.: Credisne Gallos rebellionem facturos si Caesar discedat?

Verg.: Ita credo. Nonne tu?

Dum.: Nescio. Sed cur de talibus agimus rebus? Iubere illius est qui imperium habet.

(*Eporix returns. He scowls somewhat on seeing Verginius.*)

Verg.: Salve Eporix!

Ep.: Salve!

Verg.: Ancillam te habere venalem dicit Dumnorix.

Ep.: Quam ancillam?

Dum.: Illam pallio nigro indutam—Saniam.

Verg. (starting): Saniam!

Dum.: Ita est. Num id nomen ante audisti?

Verg.: Olim in provincia nisi fallor sic appellatam mulierem apud hospitem meum Narbonensem cognovi.

Dum.: Usitatum nomen apud Gallas.

Ep.: Vendere eam nolo.

Dum. (*trying to attract his attention, without letting Verginius notice it*): Cur tandem?

Ep. (looking at Dumnorix in surprise): Ab amico eam emi qui oravit ne umquam ad alienigenas eam venderem.

(*Verginius shrugs his shoulders. He is about to reply when he catches sight of Sania, who has entered at the back of the stage. He takes a few steps toward her.*)

Dum. (whispering to Eporix): Insanisne Eporix! Nonne sentis quid moliar?

Ep.: Tu quidem insanis qui ipse consanguineam in servitutem tradas Romanis.

Dum.: Oportet. Omnia Romanorum consilia nobis deferet.

Ep.: Turpissimum est quod facis, Dumnorix.

(*Eporix returns.*)

Verg.: Agedum Eporix! Vendesne eam?

Dum. (quickly): Vendet, Vergini. Sestertium quinque milibus. Nonne, Eporix?

Ep. (*with a gesture of resignation*): Sit ita.

Verg.: Bene est. Me hic exspectate. Tabulas et argentum comparabo.

(*Goes.*)

Dum. (*looking after him*): Magnum tu tibi malum magno comparas, Romane.

ACTUS TERTIUS

(*The quarter of the Roman camp at Portus Itius occupied by the Aeduan cavalry. Dumnorix and Eporix are found in close consultation.*)

Dum.: Nunc si se continebit Sania—

Ep.: Difficillima postulas. Vix cuiquam ferendum est semper ante oculos habere iniuriae ulciscendae facultatem nec uti posse.

Dum.: Sed oportet. Nunc, si umquam, maxime oportet.

Ep.: Noli timere. Sania se continebit. Alius est quidam de quo minus certo scio.

Dum.: Quem dicis?

Ep.: Ipsum me.

Dum.: Verum igitur est quod iam dudum suspicor! Amas Saniam!

Ep.: Amo.

Dum.: Nunc intellego cur ita moleste te id ferre ostenderis cum simulata venditione tradi illam Verginio iuberem.

Ep.: Vix cum illum video manus cohibere possum.

Dum.: Et ipse hic Verginius—scis quanto nobis usui futurus sit.

Ep.: Si ultro pollicentibus Romanis credendum.

Dum.: Credendum. Totus noster est. Ille est qui signum ceteris tribunis dabit, cum tuba iussum erit in naves ascendere. Ipse videbunt milites tribunos suos exercitum deserere.

Ep.: Putasne Caesarem ob eam causam consilia mutaturum?

Dum.: Non puto. At perturbatum fractumque secum traducet exercitum.

Ep. (after a pause): Cum ita tibi placuerit, non gravabor.
Sed unum a te posco, Dumnorix.

Dum.: Nihil poscere potes quod concedere nolim.

Ep.: Cum confecta erunt omnia, hunc mihi permitte.

Dum.: Socium prodi iubes?

Ep.: Nonne ego socius? Nonne Sania? Et cum per te
libere nobilissimaque femina serva facta est nonne et illam et me
nefesta proditione proditum censes?

Dum.: Breve quoddam tempus servitura erat.

Ep.: Quid tempus ad rem? Nota inusta est famae quam
nulla quamvis longa series possit delere temporum. Hoc primum
rogo, Dumnorix; hoc unum postulo. Tune amico denegabis qui
nihil ante hunc diem sibi a te petivit?

Dum.: Sit ita. Invitus concedo quod tibi uni petenti nullo
modo recusare possum.

Ep.: Gratias tibi ago. Hoc certe efficiam ut benefici te
numquam paeniteat. Venia tua, nunc discedam. Verginium
video.

(*Hurriedly leaves, right, as Verginius enters,
left. Verginius takes precautions not to be
overheard.*)

Verg.: Hora appropinquat, Dumnorix.

Dum.: Immo urget. Eritisne parati?

Verg.: Erimus. Paucorum tamen solliciti sunt animi.

Dum.: Qua de re?

Verg.: A barbaris circumdamur. Quid si, cum minus triginta,
a nostris relictii, inter Gallorum tot milia versabimur, nemo erit
qui ira inflammatos animos cohibere possit?

Dum.: Dimitte istam curam. Dic tuis obstrictum Dum-
norigem gravissimo iure iurando se integros incolumesque omnes
illos in provinciam deducturum.

Verg.: Dicam illis. A Caesennio modo veni.

Dum.: Eritne nobiscum?

Verg.: Erit. Quinque exceptis, omnes tribuni. Nisi sacra-
mento tenerentur, haud scio an omnes legati ire recusent.

Dum.: Multi sunt Romae, si vera mihi inde deferuntur, qui
Caesarem periisse laetaturi sint.

Verg.: Plures quam credis. Cum ille tanta arrogantia usus sit ut tribunos consilium dare non patiatur, ferat quodcumque accidat.

Dum.: Quid de Sania ista tua, Vergini? An iam illa contentus es?

Verg.: Male emi, Dumnorix, cum illam emi.

Dum.: Cur, quaeso?

Verg.: Morosam protervam ancillam apud se habere magnum sane malum est.

Dum.: Multo peius infidam scelus domino machinantem.

Verg.: Haud scio an infidam malim. Quantum interest inter hanc Saniam et illam Narbonensem de qua nuper tecum sum locutus!

Dum.: Memini. Sed mutabit se fortasse aut si eadem manserit mente revendere poteris ei a quo emisti.

Verg.: Non faciam. In provinciam deducam. In rebus humanioribus fortasse et illa fiet humanior.

Dum.: Et Eporigem venditionis paenitet. Redimere velit maiore pretio quam quod munerasti.

Verg.: Quid mea refert? Iste Eporix est quem amici maxime timeant. Tam malevolis semper nos aspicit oculis.

Dum.: Nulla est causa cur timeant.

Verg.: Scio tua auctoritate satis contra eum nos munitos. Nec mihi quidem timeo sed sociis.

Dum.: Ita oportet eos qui principem locum obtinent.

(*The noise of soldiers approaching is heard. Verginius hurriedly retires behind a tent as Brutus enters, in command of a company of soldiers. Among them is an old woman, ragged and bent, whose hands are tied behind her.*)

Brut.: Te quaero Dumnorix?

Dum.: Quid est?

Brut.: Nostine hanc mulierem?

Dum.: Novi. Quid fecit? Cur a tuis ita trahitur?

Brut.: Maga quaedam vetula, ut videtur. Per castra ibat; mortem omnibus denuntiabat; timorem incutiebat imperitis.

Anus: Mortem mortem—Romani—caeci in mortem ruitis!

Brut. (*raising a leather thong*): Num tacebis, benefica calamitosa! Loris mox docebo.

Dum.: Indigna facis, Brute, qui hanc anum afficias iniuria.

Brut.: Iniuria hanc! Tune defensurus es?

Dum.: Multi venerantur eam incolae. Sibyllam appellant. Cave ne animos eorum laedas.

Brut.: Quin abeant in malam rem et incolae et Sibylla haec praeclara! Quae nisi infaustam cohibebit linguam, loris ad mortem caedam. Ad te adduxi quod tuae auctoritati magis eam morigeram fore putavi. Gallice eam tacere iube!

Dum.: Non opus est. Omnes scit linguas. Nonne ipse eam Latine loqui audiisti?

Brut.: Qua tibi placet lingua, at iube.

Dum.: Desine, mater, illis vaticinari qui futura nescire malunt.

Brut.: Quid ais! Vera tu eam pronuntiare censes?

Dum.: Numquam eam falli credunt multi.

Anus (*turning suddenly to Dumnorix and shrieking*): Aries! aries! heu cave lupum! Lupus te devorat!

Brut.: Quem appellat furibunda?

Dum.: Cornua arieti, mater.

Anus: Dentes lupo, heu nigri et acuti! Cave! Cave!

Brut.: Satis perdidit temporis. Hanc tibi permitto Sibyllam, Dumnorix. Tu providere debebis ut taceat.

Dum.: Permitte. Tacebit.

(*Brutus and the soldiers file out. The old woman's hands are untied, and she is left standing before Dumnorix. Verginius comes forward.*)

Bene egisti, mater. Abi nunc ad tuos. Mox quae tibi facienda sint audies.

Verg.: Tu illam incitasti!

Dum.: Minime. At non prohibui. Multum nos adiuvit illa.

(*A shriek is heard.*)

Quis est qui clamat?

Verg.: Nescio. Mulieris, ut sono iudicem, vox est.

Dum.: Cuius mulieris? Una Sania prope est.

Verg.: Eo repertum.

(*Hurries off. Dumnorix goes into the tent, leaving the stage empty for a short while. Just as he comes out, Eporix rushes in, breathing heavily.*)

Dum.: Quid est, Eporix? Ecquam mulierem clamantem vidisti?

Ep.: Vidi. Saniae minatus est centurio quidam truculentus. Illa auxilium implorabat.

Dum.: Tu quidem quid fecisti?

Ep.: Unus ordinum centurionem suum desiderabit.

Dum.: Insane! Num eum interfecisti?

Ep.: Interfeci.

Dum.: Temerarium facinus! Incendentur omnium contra nos animi.

Ep.: Feci quod meum erat. Non eos timeo.

Dum.: Confer te statim ad Aeduos. Non oportet te hic offendere.

(*Eporix goes away, right. Dumnorix hurries left and looks anxiously in that direction.*

Verginius comes running in, breathless with anger and excitement.)

Verg.: Sania ubi est?

Dum.: Nonne tecum?

Verg.: Non est. Quo abiit? Quocum profugit?

Dum.: Profugisse eam censes?

Verg.: Ita dicunt calones. Cum Gallo quodam.

Dum.: Quae accidit res? Cur clamabat?

Verg.: Mortuum Romanum quandam ante tabernaculum inveni. Sed ipsam quaero. Eporigem suspicor. Vidistine eum?

Dum.: Non vidi. Sed audi, Vergini—

(*He tries to hold him back, but Verginius tears himself from his grasp and goes right.*)

Verg.: Conquiram et caveat repertus.

(While the two were talking, a noise of shouting and tramping has been heard outside. This noise now increases. Dumnorix goes left to see what is going on. After a little while Brutus re-enters, and a number of soldiers behind him.)

Dum.: Quem quaeris, Brute?

Brut.: Aeduum tuum Eporigem.

Dum.: Qua de causa?

Brut.: Centurionem occidit. Mox discet civium vitam caram esse Romanis.

Dum.: Cognosti cur eum occiderit?

Brut.: Non mea refert.

Dum.: At mea. Aeduus est. Ab solis Aeduis causa cognosci debet.

Brut.: Itane? Nunc iterum tuos defendis! Memoria tene, Dumnorix, etiam Caesaris posse tandem deficere patientiam.

Dum.: Memoria teneo et Caesaris patientiam et tuam arrogantium.

Brut.: Arrogantiae me arguis!

(In the excitement of the controversy, neither has noticed the entry of Caesar, and the hush his presence has produced. Brutus now catches sight of him and at once turns to him.)

Iudicet Caesar. Salve imperator! Exspectatus venis.

Caes.: Quae inter vos orta est altercatio?

Brut.: Eporigem comprehendere volui a quo satis constat centurionem interfectum; meque, quia hoc facio, arrogantem appellat Dumnorix. Sceleratum istum protegere conatur.

Dum.: Protego neminem. Quod tibi dixi et nunc Caesare praesente dico. Liber ille est liberae civitatis. Iure nostro et accusari et condemnari oportet.

Brut.: Aeduorum ius! Quasi dicat Graecorum gravitatem!

Caes.: Tace, Decime. Erras, Dumnorix. Civem Romanum interfecit. Obnoxius est Romanis legibus. Tradere eum debes.

Brut.: Ut a militibus tuis simulato iudicio trucidetur! Non tradam. Et nobis civium vita cara.

Caes.: Iratus loqueris.

Brut. (*to Caesar*): Vides quo nos adduxerit praeclara tua clementia.

Caes.: Verborum obliviscar, Dumnorix. Iterum te nunc moneo. Trade Eporigem.

(*In obedience to a signal, the stage has gradually been filling with Gauls. As yet there are only a few present.*)

Dum.: Num apud me est? Mitte qui eum conquerant.

Caes.: Melius Romanis ipse preperire potes.

Dum.: Existimasne me esse plagiarium vestrum?

Brut.: Quid, barbare! Itane audes Caesarem alloqui?

Dum.: Non aliter eum alloquor ac ceteros. Hospes meus est, non dominus.

(*Caesennius comes running in.*)

Caesennius (*gasping*): Tribunus tuus, Caesar—Verginius—Rufus Verginius.

Caes.: Quid factum est? Dic!

Caesen.: Interfectus est—sica—a—Patere me considere. Exanimatus sum.

(*He sinks down upon the stool before the tent of Dumnorix.*)

Brut.: A quo tandem?

Caesen.: Ab Eporige, eodem qui centurionem—

Caes.: Ab Eporige! Quando? Cur?

Caesen.: Propter mulierem. Amavit eam uterque. Verginius eam cum Eporige fugientem invenit conatusque est comprehendere. Adoritur sica Gallus, Verginium perfodit.

Brut.: Audistine Caesar? Sicarius ipse effugit sed auctorem coram habemus. Nonne hunc in vincula duci iubes?

(*Dumnorix starts and looks about him.*)

Caes.: Eporigem ipse conqueriram. Mane hic, Dumnorix, cum tuis. Mox iussum erit in naves ascendere. Tunc ad navem tuis constitutam te recipe.

Dum.: Non patiar eum comprehendi.

Brut.: Tu non patieris! Insanisne?

Dum.: Nec navem conscendam.

Caes.: Meumne imperium neglegis?

Dum.: Neglego. Liber sum.

(*There is now a large group of Gauls about Dumnorix in the rear of the stage. Eporix is seen entering.*)

Brut.: En Eporix! En percussor iste!

(*The Gauls hurriedly collect about Dumnorix and Eporix.*)

Caes.: Abieci personam, Dumnorix. Ostendis te qualem te esse semper suspicatus sum.

Dum.: Abieci et Romanorum iugum. I, traduc tecum in Britanniam, istos servos tuos, feminarum vexatores. Hic dies imperio vestro extremus est.

Brut. (*rushes toward him*): Et tibi extremus, malum!

Caes.: Cohibe te, Decime. Aliter decet cum perfidis et barbaris pugnare. Signum dari iube.

(*The tuba is heard outside. Immediately there is a confused sound of running and shouting.*)

Dum.: Quid exspectamus, amici? Mortuo Verginio, nulla spes nisi in nobis. Progrediamur. Si moriendum est, at liberi moriemur, at ulti.

(*Dumnorix and the Gauls march out in column, right.*)

Caes.: Sequere cum cohortibus tribus, Decime. Redire primum iube. Si resistent, concide.

(*Brutus hurries out with all the Romans, leaving Caesar and Trebatius alone on the stage.*)

Treb.: Numquam talem esse Dumnorigem crediddissem. Simplicem, mansuetum, non callidum, non perfidum eum existimabam.

Caes.: Et erat, quattuor quidem ante annis. Illo tempore vi adsequi quod cupiebat conatus est. Eo conatu depulsus, ad dolum confugit.

Treb.: Quid cupiebat?

Caes.: Libertatem.

Treb.: Non moleste ferre debemus cupiise eum quod omnibus natura imbuerit.

Caes.: Nec fero.

Treb.: Interfici tamen iussisti.

Caes. (*after a moment's pause*): Cum subito coorta tempestas in agros irruit, etiam pulcherrimas frangit aristas.

Treb.: Parabolis uteris. Non intellego.

Caes.: Necessa est rem Romanam augeri. Quaecumque impedit res, tollenda est.

Treb.: Romanus Romane loqueris. Sed, venia tua, me istarum rerum miseret quae tibi tollendae sunt.

Caes.: Misericordem esse quis vetat? At misericordia non promoventur fines imperi.

Treb.: Vide ne quando, ut rana in fabula, nimis magni facti disrumpantur fines isti.

Caes.: Quid faceres, mi Trebat, si in villa tua tignum invenires fractum minansque.

Treb.: Fabrum arcesserem qui mihi id reficeret.

Caes.: Fortasse et imperio nostro opus est fabro.

(*An optio enters.*)

Optio: Revertitur Brutus.

Treb.: Quid? Iam revertitur! Celeriter sane rem conficit.

Caes.: Quid de Gallis?

Optio: Capti omnes. Unus Dumnorix se dedere recusavit. Gladio se diu defendit dum—

Caes.: Fuit igitur.

Optio: Fuit.

(*Brutus and his soldiers enter and fill the rear of the stage. Surrounded by them, are the Gauls, disarmed, and some with hands bound. Eporix and Sania are among them. Brutus advances to Caesar and engages in a whispered conference. A litter carried by four camp followers is brought upon the stage. Upon it is the body of Dumnorix. A groan breaks forth from the Gauls.*)

Ep. (*forcing his way before Caesar*): Mors iam mihi constituta est; satis intellego. Hoc autem unum precor antequam moriar.

Caes.: Quid id est?

Ep.: Ut sepelire liceat principem nostrum.

Caes.: Nullus deerit funeri honos.

DOES THE STYLE OF THE CIVIL WAR JUSTIFY THE DOUBT AS TO ITS AUTHENTICITY?

BY MIRIAM GREENE PASLAY
Industrial Institute and College, Columbus, Mississippi

Ancient and modern critics unite in according Caesar high praise as a stylist. That Cicero's well-known dictum, as well as the references of Hirtius and Quintilian, bear rather upon the *Gallic* than the *Civil War* may be inferential, but modern scholars are agreed that Caesar's claim to pre-eminence in literary craftsmanship rests rather upon the *Gallic War*. Within the last century several German scholars have gone so far as to deny Caesar's authorship of the *Civil War*, either wholly or in part, basing this denial upon stylistic features of the work as compared with the *Gallic War*. Most of these critics, while recognizing the latter as a model of classical Latinity, find in the *Civil War* unusual words, expressions, and constructions that vary from the usage of the former work. In a comparative study of the two compositions, therefore, it is worth while to take these conclusions into account.

B. Mosner, in a dissertation, *Num Caesar Bellum Civile Scripsit* (Kulmbach, 1865), collects a number of words and phrases which justify, he thinks, the question as to the authenticity of the *Bellum Civile*.

Some of these are as follows: *Albente caelo* (i. 68. 1), *novissimum agmen carpere* (i. 78. 4), *seniores* (ii. 4. 3), *summe cupere* (iii. 15. 8), *alacritas naturaliter innata* (iii. 92. 4), *passis palmis* (iii. 98. 2).

Soon after this followed the treatise of Heidtman, "Haben wir ausreichenden Garantieen für die Echtheit der dem C. Julius Cæsar zugeschriebenen drei Bücher de bello civile?" (Essen, 1867). Heidtman's contention is that the *Bellum Civile* is a mediocre work, and not to be assigned to the Golden Age of Latin literature at all.

R. Menge, in *De auctoribus Commentariorum de bello civile qui Caesaris nomine feruntur* (Weimar, 1873), was the first to employ a

specific method in proving his thesis. He rejects Book ii, chaps. 1-16, and expresses the conviction that Caesar incorporated the report of Trebonius without change into the *Bellum Civile*. His argument is based primarily upon matters pertaining to phraseology and syntax. I quote some of the words and phrases which he regards as suspicious, together with his comments.

(1) *B.C.* ii. 1. 3, *alluo*. Cf. *B.G.* vii. 69, *collis subluebat*; and *B.C.* iii. 97, *Montem flumen subluebat*.

(2) ii. 9. 5, *storiarum*. *Storiae* nusquam legitur nisi in hoc capite; vocabulum artis videtur.

(3) ii. 10. 3, *capreolus*. Non lēgi nisi in Vitruvio.

(4) i. 2, *adigere, quod adigit ad ostium Rhodani*. Haec conformatio verborum ita offendit ut Nipperdeius iure mendum putaverit.

(5) 3. 2, *imprudente atque inopinante Curione*. Haec verba nusquam apud Caesarem invenies composita.

Among objectionable constructions and offenses against good style, he refers to the use of the dative, in ii. 10. 7, "ut aedificio jungatur," and to the position of *in solo* in 10. 2, "Duae trabes *in solo* aeque longae distantes inter se pedes 1111 collocantur."

B. Dinter (*Quaestiones Caesarianae*, 1876) seeks to show that Book iii, chaps. 108-12, are by Hirtius, on the ground that the style resembles that of *B.G.* viii. Also Petersdorff (*Progr. Belgard*, 1879) and Venediger (*Jahrbücher für Klass. Phil.*, 1879) argue that Caesar in the *Gallic War* embodied literally the reports of his legates.

G. Landgraf, in *Untersuchungen zu Caesar und seinen Fortsetzern* (München, 1888), ascribes to Asinius Pollio Book iii, chaps. 104-12. A comparison of this portion of the *Civil War* with the letters of Pollio and the other fragments of his work reveals a striking similarity of language. For example, in the second half of chap. 112 he cites as *un-Caesarian* the following:

In hoc tractu oppidi; habitandi causa (Caesar sagt nur *incolere*): *sese traicere* (=se conferre): *insequentibus die bus*.

Among the peculiarities of Pollio's style is the archaic tendency toward the use of double diminutives. Landgraf in this connection refers (iii. 104. 3) to *Naviculam parvulam* as especially significant (cf. *B. Afr.* 54. 1). He also mentions, among others, *Causula parvula* and *Navigiolum parvulum*; such combinations occur also in the *African War*, which he assigns to Pollio, and do not occur elsewhere in Caesar.

W. Ehrenfried, on the other hand, in a dissertation, *Qua ratione Caesar in Commentariis legatorum relationes adhibuerit* (Wurzburg, 1888), makes an exhaustive comparison of all the reports of legates in both the *Gallic* and the *Civil War*, and finds the language, idiom, and syntax in all these similar and characteristic of Caesar. Adopting Menge's method, he shows further that unusual expressions and constructions can be found also in almost any book of the *Gallic War*. I quote several examples cited by him:

- B.G. iii. 9, *remiges ex provincia instituerat.* Nusquam invenies in Caesare.
iii. 82, *Cum primum per anni tempus.* Haec conformatio abhorret a Caesaris scribendi genere.
iii. 9, *Quod ad usum navium pertinet.* Caesar dixisset, quae usui sunt.

As a final result of his investigation, he finds in the *Gallic War* 677 examples of ἄπαξ λεγόμενα, of which 87 occur one or more times in the *Civil War*. The *Civil War*, on the other hand, contains 500 ἄπαξ λεγόμενα, 90 of which we meet with in the *Gallic War*. Of these he collects about 1,000 that occur only once in the ten books of the *Commentaries*. In those portions of the two works that could be viewed as the reports of legates he finds only 127 of these words. It is clear from this that the ἄπαξ λεγόμενα are scattered throughout all parts of the commentaries, since the reports of the legates constitute about one-fifth of the entire work of Caesar.

J. Zingerle, in *Wiener Studien*, XIV (1892), ascribes to Caesar the *Civil War* and chaps. 1-21 of the *Alexandrian War*. He criticizes the method of those scholars who deny Caesar's authorship of certain portions of the *Civil War* on the ground of the ἄπαξ λεγόμενα and supports Ehrenfried in the position that these occur in all parts of both commentaries. He gives a new direction to the discussion by emphasizing the colloquial element in Caesar's work.

In this he is followed by Richard Frese, who makes a searching examination of the first book of the *Gallic War* to show that Caesar in the carefully worked out portions of his *Commentaries* did not avoid words, phrases, and constructions of the common speech. Then he applies this test to the *Civil War*, and maintains that the much-discussed peculiarities of style in the latter are due to the larger intrusion of the popular speech in a more rapidly written

work. He goes on to show further that the departures from the so-called classic usage can be justified by reference to other authors, especially Cicero.

The following citations from Frese's works will serve to show his method:

B.G. i. 3. 6.: perfacile factu esse illis probat conata perficere. Hier ist auf die entschieden volkstümliche Breite des Ausdrückes zu achten: *perfacile factu —perficere*. "Factu" ist das einzige Supinum auf "u" bei Ceasar, und scheint bei *facile* völlig pleonastisch zu stehen: ebenso nur noch vii. 64. 2. *perfacile esse factu* (iv 30, 2, *optimum factu esse duxerunt*) nicht in *B.C. i. 18. 6 largiter posse*, durchaus der Umgangssprache entlehnt—*multum posse*.

i. 34. 2: si quid ipsi a Caesare opus esset, sese ad eum venturum fuisse: si quid ille se velit, illum ad se venire oportere. *Velle aliquem aliquid* sich sonst nicht in der Klassischen Prosa, ist der Umgangssprache entlehnt. Cf. *Ter. Phorm. 151, numquid aliud me vis?* und *Eun. 363, numquid me aliud?*

These and numerous other examples furnish support for the unusual constructions in the Civil War.

The use of the dative in *ut aedificio jungatur* is justified by reference to a similar use in Cicero (cf. *Acad. ii. 139, . . . virtus . . . nominem . . . jungit deo*) and also *insequentibus diebus*, on the ground that the expression was coming into use about the time that Caesar wrote his *Civil War* (cf. *Hirtius* viii. 48. 10: *Asinius Pollio Charis; Livy iii. 2. 1 and iv. 12. 1: C.I.L., I, 1, F, 710*).

Again, among the new uses of the dative which Caesar allowed himself in the *Civil War* is the so-called "geographical dative," *B.C. iii. 80: "Caesar Gomphos pervenit, quod est oppidum primum Thessaliae venientibus ab Epiro."* But even this Frese brings into connection with the syntactical usage of the *Gallic War*, pointing out in support of it an example from vii. 84: "multum ad terrendos nostros valet clamor qui post tergum *pugnantibus* exsistit."

He cites also an example from Varro (*De 1. 1. v. 47*), "sacrae viae pars, quae est a foro eunti primore clivo."

A careful re-reading of the *Gallic War* and the *Civil War* in the light of the dissertations referred to above convinces me that the attacks upon the authenticity of the latter place undue emphasis upon the difference between the two works in regard to vocabulary and syntax.

In regard to word-usage, it is obviously fair to subject the *Civil War* to crucial examination. Caesar himself, in his *Analogia*, laid down as the basis of elegance the *delectus verborum*. Quintilian recognizes also his choice of words as constituting Caesar's peculiar merit as a stylist: "exornat haec omnia mira sermonis, cuius proprie studiosus fuit, elegantia" (x. 1. 114). Modern scholars have not challenged this view (cf. Wölfflin, "Elegantiae Caesaris," *Archiv für Lat. Lex. u. Gram.*, VIII, 142).

Granted, then, that Caesar's claim to elegance of style rests in large measure upon his choice of words, still the list of so-called unusual expressions seems too small to admit of serious attack even upon the *elegance* of the *Civil War*, to say nothing of its *authenticity*. A large proportion of the words objected to by Menge and others are technical, and are not used or avoided with reference to stylistic effect (see especially Book ii, chaps. 9 and 10). Others of those condemned were used probably with literary intention. Frese justifies the combination *navicula parvula* (iii. 104. 3), criticized by Dinter and Landgraf, in these words:

Ich glaube diese an sich vulgäre ausdrucksweise hier durchaus berechtigt und beabsichtigt ist. Caesar spielt aufs cognomen illustre des Pompeius an. . . . Der grosse Pompeius auf einen Fishernachen ermordet! Die einstige strahlende Macht und Herrlichkeit und sein elender Tod bilden einen tragischen Kontrast und auf diesen hat Caesar mit den beiden Diminutiven hinweisen wollen.¹

Frese shows further that the jurist, Sulpicius Rufus, in his carefully composed letter of condolence to Cicero (*Ep.* iv. 5. 4) used diminutives: in "unius mulierculae animula si iactura facta est tanto opere commoveris?" Again, in regard to *passis palmis* (iii. 98. 2), Frese says: "die ungewöhnliche Situation hat das ungewöhnliche Wort veranlassen. Caesar selbst steht wie ein Gott da, die Besiegten liegen vor ihm in Staube mit erhobenen Händen wie Betende."

Albente caelo, objected to by Mosner and explained by Kraner-Hofman as a poetic expression (cf. Virgil *Aen.* iv. 586) is found in

¹ "I believe this expression, though vulgar in itself, is here justifiable and intentional. Caesar is playing upon the illustrious cognomen of Pompey. The great Pompey murdered in a fisherman's boat! The brilliance of his former might and glory and the misery of his death form a tragic contrast, and Caesar through the use of the two diminutives calls attention to this."

Quintilian viii. 3. 35, and also in *Bellum Afr.* 11. 80, and Frese holds that Caesar intended to use the expression to indicate an earlier hour than *prima luce*—daybreak as opposed to sunrise.

Making due allowance, therefore, for differences growing out of the nature of the subject-matter, and for mistakes of copyists, the list, I think, would appear meager.

Everywhere in the *Civil War*, even in contested portions, the general linguistic quality seems to me distinctly that of Caesar. Taking, for example, Book ii, chap. 10, one of the chapters containing the largest proportion of the *ἀταξ λεγόμενα*, and comparing it with *B.G.* iv. 17 and *B.G.* vii. 23, we note common words occurring in all three as follows: “instituerunt, coniungunt, defiguntur, distabat, iniiciunt, fastigati, subiectis, inmissi, religant” (*illigata* in iv. 17), “contineant, collocant, haec forma” (vii. 23: *hac forma*). The two sentences given below illustrate the point as a mere list cannot do:

B.G. vii. 23: *Trabes directae perpetuae in longitudinen paribus intervallis distantes inter se binos pedes in solo collocantur.* Cf. *B.C.* ii. 10: *Duae primum trabes in solo aequae longae, distantes inter se pedes IV collocantur inque eis columellae pedum in altitudinem V. defiguntur.*

In this chapter also we find characteristic alliteration and pleonasm. In the sentence (11 ff. Moberly) beginning: *Ita fastigate atque, note alliteration with letter c, capreolis collocatae conteguntur.* Also ll. 28 and 29, *Coria centonibus conteguntur.*

The pleonastic repetition of the antecedent in the relative clause, *cuius musculi haec erat forma* (l. 15), seems to me significant in view of Frese's investigation. He says: “Die Wiederholung des Berziehungswortes im Relativsatz kommt in *B.G.* sehr häufig vor, interessant ist aber dass diese schwerfällige Ausdrucksweise allmählich seltener wird.”¹ In *B.G.* it occurs 8 times in Book i, in the remaining six 11 times. In *B.C.* it occurs in all only 4 times, one of these occurrences being in a suspected passage.

Among the favorite words and expressions met with in both the *Gallic War* and the *Civil War*, a few may be noted as follows: *certiorem facere; accedit quod; pugnare acriter; coepisse* and

¹ The repetition of the relative pronoun occurs very often in the *Gallic War*, but, interesting to note, this heavy combination becomes rarer and rarer.

incipere (with inf. 66 times); *instituere* (with inf. 24 times); *minus commode, imprimis*; ablatives of the fourth declension, *iussu, iniussu, ictu, auctu*, etc.; phrases, *uno tempore, ut tum accidit, non ita magno, non ita multo*, etc.

As to syntax proper, while the irregularities do not justify the attacks on the authenticity of the *Civil War*, they are sufficient to indicate somewhat greater carelessness in composition, and the larger intrusion of the *Sermo Cotidianus*.

Aside from word and syntactical usage, other characteristic indications of Caesar's style to be found in the *Civil War* are:

1. Alliteration: Cf. *B.C.* i. 13: "Caesari consecuti milites consistere coegerunt", and *B.G.* iv. 27: "Convenire et se civitatesque suas Caesari commendare coepérunt"; *B.C.* ii. 38: "Credens consilium commutat et proelio rem committere constituit"; *B.G.* i. 23: "Confiderent, commutato consilio atque itinere converse . . . coeperunt."

Numerous others might be cited; alliteration with the letter *c* is chosen here because it is regarded as especially Caesarian.

2. Anaphora: Cf. *B.C.* i. 22 with *B.G.* i. 14.

B.C. i. 21 (*quid . . . quid . . . quid*):

Tanta erat summae rerum exspectatio, ut alius in aliam partem mente atque animo traheretur, *quid* ipsis Corfiniemsibus, *quid* Domitio, *quid* Lentulo, *quid* reliquis accideret, qui quosque eventus exciperent.

B.G. i. 14 (*quod . . . quod . . . quod*):

Quod si veteris contumeliae obliisci vellet, num etium recentium iniuriarum, *quod* eo invito iter per provinciam per vim temptassent, *quod* Aeduos, *quod* Ambarros, *quod* Allobrogas vexassent, memoriam deponere posse? *Quod* sua victoria tam insolenter gloriarentur, *quodque* tam diu se impune iniurias tulisse admirarentur, eodem pertinere.

Cf. also *B.C.* i. 22 and *B.G.* iv. 19.

3. Position of *ut* after the first or second word: Cf. *B.C.* iii. 79: *et suis ut esset*, and *B.G.* i. 25: *Multo ut praeoptarent*.

4. Sentence structure: Caesar is fond of beginning a period with an ablative absolute, followed by several subordinate clauses, and ending it with the perfect participle of a deponent verb. Cf. *B.C.* i. 21 and *B.G.* iv. 9.

a) *B.C.* i. 21:

Quibus rebus cognitis Caesar eti magni interesse arbitrabatur quam primum oppido potiri cohortesque ad se in castra traducere, ne qua aut largitionibus aut animi confirmatione aut falsis numtiis commutatio fieret voluntatis, quod saepe in bello parvis momentis magni casus intercederent, tamen veritus, ne militum introitu et nocturni temporis licentia oppidum diriperetur, eos, qui venerant, collaudat atque in oppidum dimittit, portas murosque asservari jubet.

b) *B.G.* iv. 19:

Quod ubi Caesar comperit, omnibus eis rebus confectis, quarum rerum causa traducere exercitum constituerat, ut Germanis metum iniceret, ut Sugambros ulcisceretur, ut Ubios obsidione liberaret, diebus omnino XVIII trans Rhenum consumptis, satis et ad laudem et ad utilitatem profectum arbitratus, se in Galliam recepit pontem rescidit.

In these two passages note further the balancing of phrases, the use of verbs of the same mood and tense, and the anaphora.

So far as the differences of style in the two commentaries can be reduced to general terms, the *Civil War* presents less evenness and variety of structure, less care for balanced effects, the rarer use of long periods, and, on the whole, more inequality of workmanship, some parts showing the lack of careful revision, while others are composed in Caesar's best manner. In the first and third books, for example, along with the vivid narration of events around Ilerda and the description of Petreius' despair, the brilliant account of the siege of Salonae and the battle of Pharsalus, we find chapters like 15 and 18 in Book i, and 66 and 68 in Book iii, in which facts seem to be jotted down in notebook form. In the second book, which is generally admitted to be inferior on the whole to the first and third, we find in the speech of Curio a masterpiece of eloquence.

As examples of the more careless sentence structure we note in *B.C.* i. 15 the following: "Milites imperat; mittunt; Interea legio duodecima Caesarem consequitur. Cum his duabus Asculum Picenum proficiscitur." It had been remarked that the second legion here referred to was mentioned eight chapters back, in i. 7.

Again in chap. 18: "Lucretius et Attius de muro deiecerunt . . . Caesar eos cohortes cum exercitu suo coniunxit Attiumque incolumen dimisit. Caesar primis diebus castra magnis operibus munire instituit."

In passages like these it seems that Caesar does not avoid the periodic structure on literary grounds. In the first six chapters of Book i, on the other hand, his abandonment of the periodic structure is in the highest degree effective. Through the succession of short sentences here are suggested the rapidity with which the events leading up to the war followed each other, the excited activities of Caesar's opponents, and his own scorn at the whole status of affairs summed up in the sentence which closes the passage, *omnia divina humanaque jura permiscentur*.

As further illustration of the greater deliberation in composition or revision of the earlier commentary it is interesting to compare *B.C.* ii. 9 with *B.G.* iv. 17. In these two chapters, dealing with subject-matter of much the same character (the first, the construction of a tower; the second, the construction of a bridge), appear significant differences.

In *B.C.* ii. 9 note the more carelessly constructed period, the monotonous repetition of the *ubi* clause throughout the chapter (6 times), and the absence of rhythm and careful balancing of phrases as compared with *B.G.* iv. 17.

The unfinished style of the *Civil War* is indicated further in the use of pronouns. The relative construction as a means of connecting sentences appears considerably more often in the *Civil* than in the *Gallic War*. In *B.C.* it occurs, according to Frese, 190 times within 123 pages of Teubner text; in *B.G.* not quite 190 times within 168 pages (7:5). This shows that Caesar did not exercise here the care in varying constructions and defining the exact nature of the relationship that is so evident in his more sustained work.

Quidam is used in *B.G.* 16 times, in *B.C.* 31 times. Note especially in iii. 66 twice the expression *quibusdam de causis*. In the passage iii. 65. 2-67 some form of *quidam* occurs 6 times. This suggests that the author here did not wish to take the time to go into an exact and detailed account of events. Among examples of the careless use of the demonstrative pronoun note especially ii. 22. 2 and 3: "*L. L. Domitius . . . navibus tribus comparatis . . . projectus est. Hunc conspicatae naves, quae missa Bruti consuetudine cotidiana ad portum excubabant, sublati ancoris sequi cooperunt. Ex his unum ipsius navigium contendit et fugere perseveravit.*"

In the *Civil War* the narrative throughout suggests more or less haste, even mental disturbance, and concentration upon a single point of view—one that concerns primarily the writer himself. In the *Gallic War* we feel a singular absence of the personal tone. Here Caesar deals with facts stated with clearness, directness, and every appearance of impartiality, and upon these he builds, when occasion requires, irresistibly clear-cut arguments, which appeal to the reason rather than to the imagination of the reader. His style lacks the ornament and color and what we might call the human-heartedness of Livy's, for example. It was not from Caesar that our English Renaissance writers, Peele, Llyly, Surrey, learned the *aureate* effects, to use a word of which they were so fond, but from Livy, Cicero, Seneca, and other Latin writers of distinctly rhetorical quality.

At the same time, underneath the cool objectivity of Caesar's style is the suggestion of range and power, and the exhilarating note of satisfaction in the review of arduous undertakings carried to a successful issue.

The pleasure that he betrays in working up minor incidents into dramatic episodes, the care that he bestows in describing the construction of a bridge, his keen interest in places and peoples, all this deliberate and lucid descriptiveness on the part of an author who seems in a sense quite aloof from it all, reveals a calmness and buoyancy of mind that we miss in the *Civil War*.

Apart from the technical differences, one finds, I think, in the *Civil War* a distinctly more partisan attitude. In *B.C.* i. 32 Caesar makes reference to the tedious harangues of Cato, using a belittling ablative absolute: "Latum ab X tribunis plebis contra dicentibus inimicis, *Catone vero acerrime repugnante et pristina consuetudine dicendi mora dies extrahente.*"

Again in *B.C.* iii. 31 the allusion to Scipio is ironical: "His temporibus Scipio detrimentis quibusdam circa mentem Amanum acceptis imperatorem se appellaverat."

In chaps. 3 and 4 he ridicules Pompey and his army, playing upon the word *magnus* (*magnam classem* being used four times within eight lines), and ironically applying to petty chiefs and princes the terms *reges, dynasti, tetrarchi*. In the same vein is the

long, detailed account of Pompey's forces, and the emphasis upon their *non-Roman* character, drawn, as Caesar pointedly relates, from any- and everywhere.

In the *Gallic War*, in the discussion of individuals, even of arch-enemies, like Vercingetorix, Caesar leaves room for the operation of the reader's sympathies. On the other hand, in the *Civil War*, as we have seen, he reveals to a far greater extent his own mood in the characterization of his enemies. This is felt in his *speeches* especially. There is the same cogency in dealing with facts, but there is, further, more effort at psychological appeal, and in some ways more oratory than in those of the *Gallic War*. In the *Civil War* Caesar makes discriminating use of *oratio obliqua* in quoting his own speeches. In i. 7, for example, there is a frankly personal appeal to his soldiers. The primitive human impulse to resent injustice and strike back at one's enemies speaks through this appeal; and the *oratio obliqua*, bringing the ego less vividly before the reader, is less offensive, and less likely to forfeit sympathy. In connection with the revelation of himself, his detailed report of the *speech of Curio* in the *oratio recta* deserves mention for the light it throws on Caesar's loyalty to his friends. This passage recalls the record of the standard-bearer, whose chief thought while dying was that the eagle should be restored to Caesar undishonored, and also that of Crastinus, who said before going into battle: "Faciam, imperator, ut aut vivo mihi aut mortuo gratias agas." In all these records we have Caesar's tribute to those who had died fighting for his cause; and they illustrate the peculiar psychological quality of the *Civil War* as compared with the other commentary.

In two works whose immediate intention was so different, it was inevitable that there should be a difference of style. In one we have a close and progressive narrative and judicial calm; and though the events are hurried and stirring enough in themselves, they are set down in moments of deliberation and reflectiveness. In the *Civil War* the press of circumstances, the necessity for action and decision in altogether different environment, the intensity of feeling aroused in Caesar in this struggle for something more than life—all this, with the actual hurry that attended the setting down of this material, robs Caesar's style of some of the peculiar and even elegance of the *Gallic War*.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF CONDITIONAL STATEMENTS

By R. B. STEELE
Vanderbilt University

A conditional statement is made up of a condition and a conclusion, or, stated in terms derived from the Greek, a protasis and an apodosis, spelled by students in various ways. These are the parts of a hypothetically stated concept, and when the condition is given the conclusion must necessarily follow. This is true of every conditional statement, no matter to what type it may belong. In the statement (*a*) "If I had seen him (*b*) I should have known him," given (*a*) then (*b*) must necessarily follow, at least so far as my thinking is concerned. This may not be objectively true, for it may be shown by testimony that I did see him and did not know him. Still, while the hypothesis stands, the logical bond between the two parts cannot be broken. This is not a matter of type, of condition, of tense, or of mood, for the parts may be placed in any form we will and the bond will not be broken. "If I had held him, he would have kept quiet" gives quiet as the result of holding. We may put this in any time and according to any type, and through all the changes quiet must abide as the result of the holding.

As both the Latin and the English use the pluperfect tense to express the past unreal condition, an imperfect tense for the present, and a present tense for the less vivid future (ideal), examples from both languages will serve equally well as illustrations of the logical relation of the condition and the conclusion. We find in Horace *Odes* ii. 17. 27-30:

Me truncus inlapsus cerebro
Sustulerat, nisi Faunus ictum
Dextra levasset, Mercurialium
Custos virorum,

"Me the tree falling on my cranium had carried off, unless Faunus, guardian of the men of Mercury, had lightened the blow with his right hand."

Metrical necessity may be pleaded for the use of the indicative *sustulerat* for the subjunctive *sustulisset*, yet both would equally express the inevitable result, and the meaning would have been the same had it been put in the form of a result clause, "Unless Faunus had lightened the blow, the result would have been that the tree carried me off." With this we shall place another illustration from Horace *Satires i. 6. 78-82*:

Vestem servosque sequentis
In magno ut populo, siqui vidisset, avita
Ex re praebri sumptus mihi crederet illos.
Ipse mihi custos incorruptissimus omnis
Circum doctores aderat.

"If anyone had seen my clothing and the slaves following, he might suppose these expenses furnished from ancestral property. My father was my unswerving guide around to all the teachers."

The usual unreal condition indicates the non-performance of a possible action, but in this, *si qui vidisset* is not merely unreal, but impossible, for the last lines show that, not some slaves, but the father of Horace, attended him. In the first statement quoted, the hypothetical result is physical; in the second, mental; and both are expressed with the same certainty. This fact naturally raises the question whether the action expressed in the conclusion, whether it be physical or mental, can always be expressed in terms of result. The answer to this can be given only after an analysis of other statements.

We find in Caesar's *Gallic War i. 36. 2*:

Si ipse populo Romano non praescriberet non oportere sese a populo Romano in suo iure impediri.

"If he did not dictate to the Roman people he ought not to be impeded in his right by the Roman people."

Here we have the form "If A is, then B is," the two being concurrent actions, and B in no way the result of A. Another good illustration of concurrent actions is found in the same book, i. 48. 6:

Ad eos se equites recipiebant: hi, si quid erat durius, concurrebant; si qui, graviore vulnere accepto, equo deciderat, circumsistebant; si quo erat longius prodeundum aut celerius recipiendum, tanta erat horum exercitatione celeritas, ut iubis equorum sublevati cursum adaequarent.

"To them [the footmen] the knights were accustomed to betake themselves: these, if anything was going rather hard, kept running together; if

anyone had fallen from his horse, having received rather a severe wound, they stood around him; if there had to be anywhere a further advancement or a quick retreat, such was the speed of these because of their exercise, that, aided by the manes of the horses, they kept equal pace."

In this the last actions are concurrent, and, instead of a condition, a general temporal statement might have been used. Strictly speaking, the terms protasis (fore-arranged) and apodosis (after-given) do not apply, for here, if we be allowed to use the term, there is a syndosis instead of an apodosis.

We shall now consider a well-known statement in English: "And every life, no matter if its every hour is rich with love, and every moment jeweled with a joy, will, at its close, become a tragedy as sad and deep and dark as can be woven of the warp and woof of mystery and death." In this condition and conclusion are antithetic—the brightness of life ends in the darkness of death. The conclusion is in spite of the conditions given, and altogether different from what we should expect.

In the sentences which have been given as illustrations we find that there are three types of relation between the condition and the conclusion: (1) resultant; (2) concurrent; and (3) adversative. These types are as distinct as are the grammatical types of conditions, and we shall give some illustrations of each, as suggestions for a method of dealing with conditional statements both in school and in college.

I. RESULTANT

The relation of cause and effect is by far the most common, though in making this statement we do not press too closely the philosophical meaning of the terms. We think that we know results in the physical world; and we also think that we know them when we consider the relation of the condition and the conclusion. So numerous are the illustrations that we shall give only one as a general example, and then consider some special cases. We find in Vergil *Aeneid* i. 58-59:

Ni faciat, maria ac terras caelumque profundum
Quippe ferant rapidi secum verrantque per auras.

"If he did not do this, verily the result would be that the speedy ones would carry the sea, the land, and the deep heaven with them and sweep them through the air."

There are two divisions of the unreal conditions, which, because of their form, are worthy of an extended presentation. These are (a) statements with the pluperfect in the condition and the imperfect in the conclusion; and (b) statements with the imperfect in the condition and the pluperfect in the conclusion.

a) This is one of the most common forms of conditional statement in Latin as well as in English. The usual explanation is that it is mixed condition, but, logically considered, there is no mixture. It differs from those which have the same tense in both condition and conclusion only in this: that the result is in the present, while the cause is in the past, instead of the two being synchronous. It is easy to frame or to select a succession of statements in which the cause is put farther and farther into the past: "If it had rained this morning (or yesterday), it would now be muddy"; "If the colonists had not declared their independence in 1776, they might now be English subjects"; "If Columbus had not discovered America, it might be still unknown to Europeans"; "If, in some age far removed into a by-past eternity, a bird of an unknown kind had not stepped in the mud of an unknown lake, there would not be today bird tracks in the Old Sandstone of Connecticut." All of these are of the same type, giving a present result and a past cause, more or less remote.

None of the Latin writers deals with momentary causes and the age-long results of "footprints on the sands of time," yet we shall quote a few statements in which the causes operated at some time preceding the results. The first is from Plautus *Trinummus* 632:

Quid faceres, si quis docuisset te ut sic odio esses mihi?

"What would you now be doing, if someone had taught you to be hateful to me?"

Livy xxii. 60. 8:

Quem si isti ducem secuti essent, milites in castris Romanis, non captivi in potestate hostium essent.

"If those fellows had followed their leader, they would now be soldiers in the Roman camp, not captives in the power of the enemy."

Livy xxxi. 38. 6:

Neque enim ne regis quidem primum consilium . . . reprehendum foret, si modum prosperae pugnae imposuisset.

"For not even the king's first plan need be criticised, if he had put a limit to the prosperous fight."

The time between the action in the condition and in the conclusion is longest in the last sentence, about two hundred years, but such a long period is unusual. Generally the actors are contemporaneous, or the actions occur within the experiences of one actor, and the intervening period is short.

b) A condition stating the cause in the present and the result in the past is an apparent impossibility. "If A were, B would have been" seems absurd, yet is proper in certain types of statement. In these the action in the conclusion (the result) is placed at some point along the line of a continuous action or state (a continuous cause) expressed in the condition. In this type we find enduring characteristics expressed more frequently than continuous activities, as in the statement, "If he were an honest man, he never would have done this." Other illustrations are not hard to find. "This man if he were a prophet would have known what manner of woman *this is* that toucheth him: for she is a sinner"; "If justice were always observed in the conduct of a state, such an act never would have been tolerated." The characteristic may have abided through the eternities: "If it were not a law of nature that water expanded on freezing, all life in our lakes would have been destroyed long ago"; "If God were good, he never would have created evil." One illustration of continuous action will be enough: "If the earth revolved from west to east, many a scene in literature would have been drawn with different lines." As illustrations in Latin we shall quote four sentences similar in form, although no very extended period of time is involved: Plautus *Trinummus* 832-37:

—nam apsque foret te,
Distraxissent disque tulissent satellites tui me miserum foede
. . . . ni tua pax propitia foret praesto.

"For were it not for you your satellites would have foully dismembered and swept me away if your propitious peace were not present."

Vergil *Aeneid* v. 398-400:

si nunc foret illa iuventus
Haud equidem pretio inductus pulchroque iuvenco
Venissem,

"If now there were that youth, not indeed led by the prize and the beautiful bullock would I have come."

Livy i. 28. 9:

si ipse discere posses fidem, vivo tibi ea disciplina a me adhibita esset,

"If you were able to learn loyalty, that discipline would have been applied by me to you alive."

Livy vi. 40. 12:

ergo si esset libera haec civitas, non tibi frequentes suclamassent?

"Now if this were a free state, would not hosts have cried out to you?"

The distinction between characteristics and actions is not always clear to unpracticed students. Many a one has seen nothing incongruous in the statement "If it were raining, I would have brought my umbrella," until by its side was placed "If it were rainy weather, I would have brought my umbrella." Then it is seen that "raining" is of the present only, while "rainy weather," though it is of the present, also stretches far enough into the past to be the cause of taking the umbrella.

2. CONCURRENT

The concurrent or coincident relation is not freely expressed in conditions outside of philosophical discussions. In such writings conclusions are freely put in the form "If A is, B is," where B is a modified phase of A. If all is true, then some part is also true, as in the following from Coleridge's *Aids to Reflection*: "If this appear extravagant, it is an extravagance which no man can indeed learn from another" (p. 225); "If you attach any meaning to justice, it must be the same to which you refer when you affirm or deny it of any other personal agent" (p. 323). These last two are universal propositions expressed in conditional form: "All sin is original," "All forms of justice are fundamentally the same." Compare with these the following: "If, as Pascal has said, it is a pleasure to be cold when one can warm one's self, then it is a pleasure to work when one can rest after it" (Jules Payot, *The Education of the Will*, p. 276, Eng. Trans.). Similar are the following from Münsterberg's *Psychology and the Teacher*: "If we stroll through the streets, the

people who pass by form entities in which the details are not separated from one another" (p. 159); "If in this way we understand the mechanism of attention, we can easily see where the interest of the teacher must center" (p. 162); "If education is to secure certain actions, the safest way will be by developing certain likes and dislikes, pleasures and displeasures, enthusiasms and aversions."

There is a clear-cut illustration in Cicero *De officiis* iii. 15. 61:

uterque si ad loquendum venerit, non plus quam semel loquetur.

"If each shall have come to speaking, he will not speak more than once."

Here also we shall place a piece of logical reasoning from Augustine's *De Civitate Dei* xi. 26:

Nam qui non est, utique nec falli potest; ac per hoc sum, si fallor. Quia ergo sum si fallor, quo modo esse me fallor, quando certum est me esse, si fallor.

"For he who is not, assuredly cannot be mistaken; and therefore I am, if I am mistaken. Therefore because I am if I am mistaken, how am I mistaken that I am, when it is sure that I am, if I am mistaken."

3. ADVERSATIVE

The use of "even if" in English, and of *etsi* and *etiamsi* in Latin shows the possibility of putting all adversative statements in the form of conditions. But whether they are expressed as conditions, or with concessive particles, students generally explain such statements as concessive because they concede something, and few venture beyond this. Münsterberg says: "Normal reading is to no small extent dependent on the expected idea" (*Psychology and the Teacher*, p. 277), yet it is equally true that what analysis reveals as the unexpected is not ordinarily felt as such. This is shown especially in the common translation of three forms of Latin statements: (a) many sentences containing *cum*; (b) some ablatives absolute; and (c) some statements with *ut . . . sic* and their equivalents.

a) Progress is along the line of least resistance, as Herbert Spencer says, and as the temporal use of *cum* is far more common than either the causal or the adversative, it is usually translated "when." And this is true even in such statements as "interfectus

est, cum prudenter pugnaret," "He was killed when (though) he was fighting skilfully." Without the adverb, "when he was fighting" would be all right as a translation, but this word introduces an element which renders the result unexpected.

b) The man of whom Wordsworth wrote:

A primrose by the river's brim
A yellow primrose 'twas to him
And it was nothing more,

would find many kindred spirits if he should abide for a while among students looking at the ablative absolute. For them it is an ablative absolute, and it is nothing more. Yet in some of the ablatives there is something more, as can be clearly seen if the construction is carefully analyzed. Let us take an illustration from Livy's fine portrayal of the fight at Trasumene, in xxii. 5. 1:

Consul perculsis omnibus ipse satis, ut in re trepida, impavidus, turbatos ordines vertente se quoque ad dissonos clamores, instruit ut tempus locusque patitur.

"The consul, though all others were terror stricken, unterrified amid the confusion, as time and place permits, draws up the ranks disturbed because each one was turning himself to the discordant sounds."

It is only the translation by the adversative clause that makes the consul stand out distinct amid the turmoil of the fight.

c) We find in Vergil *Aeneid* v. 667:

Primus et Ascanius, cursus ut laetus equestris
Ducebat, sic acer equo turbata petivit
Castræ.

"And foremost Ascanius, though joyous he was leading the cavalry movements, yet eager on his horse he sought the disturbed camp."

Here was an apparent conflict of duties, and he unexpectedly left the one to which he had been assigned to attend to the other. This unexpected interruption of his joy ought certainly to be indicated by the translation, even though the American edition from which the lines were copied gives no indication in the vocabulary that the particles *ut . . . sic* can have the meaning "though . . . yet."

The mention of Ascanius flying to the aid of the burning ships suggests, by contrast, that other scene portrayed by Mrs. Hemans:

The boy stood on the burning deck
Whence all but him had fled;
The flames that lit the battle's wreck
Shone round him o'er the dead;
Yet beautiful and bright he stood
As born to rule the storm.

Putting into Latin the contrasted parts somewhat after the fashion of Vergil, we have:

Ut dirus fuit inmissis Volcanus habenis
Sic pulcher puer inter clara incendia stabat.

"Though dire Vulcan rages with loosened reins,
Yet the boy kept standing beautiful amid the glowing flames."

In translating Livy the determination of the value of *ut . . . sic* is especially important, as they are most freely used in adversative statements, and to translate "as . . . so" leaves out of sight the contrast intended. Take, for example, Livy i. 25. 7, in the story of the fight of the Horatii and the Curiatii:

Forte is integer fuit, ut universis solus neququam par, sic adversus singulos ferox.

"By chance he was uninjured, and though alone he was by no means a match for them altogether, yet confident against them one by one."

These are illustrations enough of adversative statements, and of the fact that they run counter to our expectations. The value of an analysis lies in the fact that the reader must stop, look, and think in order to see which way the current of thought is running. Practice in this can best start with building up statements with contrasted words. Put down the word "love" and over against it the word "hate." No one would expect the two to be used as predicates with one subject and one object. Yet it can be seen that they can go together all right in the statement "Though Brutus loved Caesar, yet he killed him."

The classification of conditional sentences according to grammatical types has much merit in it. Yet the key to these can be easily worked, and all that is needed to distinguish the different

types in Latin is the ability to distinguish the indicative mood from the subjunctive, and the different tenses of the subjunctive from each other. But the only key that will open the logical relation of the condition and the conclusion in a conditional statement is a full understanding of their meaning. "Though . . . yet" may sometimes be a useful sign-post, yet analysis is necessary to show why the sign is there. To require of students, either in high school or in college, nothing more than the determination of the grammatical type, is to keep them within the limits of an early discipline; to turn their attention to analysis is to point their way to a much more valuable mental process. Every conditional statement requires a rational activity for the determination of the relation of the parts, whether this is resultant, concurrent, or adversative. This requires the use, not of old and practically lifeless terms, but of terms which are met with in many fields of mental activity. In short, analysis requires logical activity, instead of the application of lifeless rules.

A YEAR—OR MORE—OF GREEK

BY CLYDE PHARR
Ohio Wesleyan University

Some years ago, when Greek held such undisputed sway in our higher educational system, certain methods and means of approach to the subject were perfected which served well the purpose of giving beginners a stable background for a continuation of their work.

More recently the steady and continued decline of Greek studies has caused a searching of hearts among members of the teaching profession and among friends of the classics everywhere; and grave doubts have begun to arise whether we as teachers may not be partially, or largely, responsible for the present situation. As a result, some of the better-equipped and more-favored members of the profession have felt called upon to enter the field and preach, now to their colleagues, pleading for a better preparation and a more effective presentation of their subject, and again to the public at large, warning them of the inevitable danger and loss attendant upon such a curtailment of the study of Greek as now prevails. Others, feeling that perhaps the system employed in teaching beginners was at fault, have addressed themselves to this difficulty, and the long-suffering profession has had foisted upon it one method after another, each claiming to be a solution of the vexed problem, yet each proving to be more unsuccessful than the last, till the very name of "method" has become a nightmare to all sincere friends of the subject. Meanwhile, the number of students enrolling in Greek has continued to decline, and in many places has approached nearer and nearer to the vanishing-point; and many have begun to realize that no amount of preaching can save us as long as the mass of students who now take Greek are dissatisfied with results and the majority of the most intelligent among them feel that the time spent upon Greek has been largely wasted.

The conditions confronting us today—when, if we are to make friends and lovers of Greek out of our candidates, it must be done during the first year—are so radically different from those with which we had to deal in the past that it is time for us to go over the whole situation carefully and see if there are not some features which can and must be improved if we are to deal successfully with the present state of affairs. Under the system now most commonly in use, which is the same, with unimportant modifications, as the one employed by our fathers, the student is put to work on a beginner's book covering a large part, or perhaps the whole, of the school year. This book usually contains all the formal grammar the student will need for some years of reading in Attic Greek, developed and illustrated by various types of detached sentences. As a rule these sentences are based on Xenophon's *Anabasis*, and the vocabulary is drawn from the same source; so that when he completes the beginning book the student will be able to pass into the *Anabasis*. If the student is conscientious and will spend some two hours in the preparation of each lesson, reciting from three to five hours a week, he will ordinarily find that at the end of the year, by hard work, he may be able to read something like a Teubner page of the *Anabasis* in some two or three hours. In preparation for this feat, if he has taken Greek, say, four hours a week, he has spent in the thirty-six weeks of the school year probably not less than four hundred and thirty-two hours of work. Many students, and among them some of the most capable, do not continue their study of Greek farther, and from these we get the practically unanimous verdict that Greek is a waste of time. To make the situation still more disheartening for us, they are in most cases not without reason on their side. Any well-equipped school is not living up to its opportunities if it cannot give courses which will be of more practical and cultural value, with the same amount of time and work expended, than this which has been invested with so much labor and pains in Greek. For even though the students have made the acquaintance, in a slight measure, of Xenophon, they have not been permitted to come into contact with Greek genius and the wonderful capabilities of the Greek artistic nature as it finds expression in the great masterpieces of Hellenic literature. The time is long

since past for us to indulge in a blind and unreasoning idolatry of everything Greek, simply because it is Greek, and we can no longer afford to shut our eyes to the fact that Xenophon is not intrinsically inspiring to the mass of beginning students, and that he is inexpressibly dreary to most. Although it is quite true that the exceptional teacher can, and often does, awaken a real interest in Xenophon, just as a remarkable teacher can arouse enthusiasm in any subject, this interest is dependent upon the teacher, and when separated from him cannot long survive. If we are to depend upon what one man in a hundred can do, the day is lost and Greek is surely doomed. We must rely for our success, as we do in all other subjects, upon the capabilities and possibilities of the mass of those who are teaching in this field. It is only fair to say in passing that the mass of Greek teachers in this country will not suffer by comparison, in the matter of training and teaching ability, with those in any of the other subjects of the curriculum.

But let us take up once more our beginner, where we left him at the end of his endeavors for the first year. If, in spite of the unattractiveness of the beginning, he persists in continuing the work, the way is made unnecessarily difficult and discouraging for him. After having become fairly well-grounded in Attic Greek, in Xenophon's vocabulary, and in his idioms and circle of ideas, the student who would go on farther is usually thrown into Homer, with a vocabulary and dialect differing in many essentials from the one he has just learned. When he has had sufficient time to begin to feel at home here and can begin to read Homer with some degree of real pleasure and appreciation (and incidentally has lost sight of many of his Attic forms), if his ardor still remains undampened and he still feels determined to continue, he is thrown back into Attic Greek once more and must acquire again, at the expense of considerable labor and pains, much of that which he had so carefully learned before. And then teachers of the subject profess to wonder why more students do not take Greek!

By far the majority of students do not continue with Greek more than two years, and if they follow the ordinary routine they have probably spent the bulk of this time on Xenophon and his limited circle of ideas. Many of these students feel, and perhaps

correctly, that Greek for them has been largely a waste of time which could have been invested to better advantage. If Greek is to continue to occupy an important position in our educational system, it is not enough that the third or fourth year should be made to bear fruit, while the first year, and often a considerable part of the second, are merely a means toward an end which in too many cases is never reached. The first year must be made as attractive and rich in content as we now make the third or fourth. It must be made an end in itself, so that the student who goes no farther may feel repaid for the effort expended. It is in the first few months of his work that the student forms his most lasting impressions and acquires a liking or a distaste for his subject, and it is here that the battle must be fought and won, or lost, for the cause of Greek.

The writer is firmly convinced, by a series of experiments covering several years, that the first two years, and particularly the first year, of Greek work must and can be radically revised to meet modern conditions. This must be done, of course, without any sacrifice of scholarly ideals; and we must keep clearly in mind that the two most important objects of the first year's work are to make the student desire to go on with further work, and to give him the ability to go on. Neither of these can be given up or made subordinate to the other. The time has not come to throw away all the benefits of the experience of the past in teaching this subject, but whatever is good in the old must be retained and adapted to changed conditions.

For the work of the first year, including the beginner's book with its dreary and forbidding detached sentences, leading up to Xenophon, who is not much better, there ought to be substituted a book introducing the student at the very earliest practicable moment (experience has shown that by a judicious use of explanatory notes this can be done profitably after ten or twelve preliminary lessons) to continuous reading from a Greek author who is intrinsically interesting and who is really worth while. Instead of continuing with detached sentences, as heretofore, the principles of grammar can be illustrated and developed amply from further lessons in this author, and the remaining work in the beginner's

book should continue until all the more common forms and constructions are mastered, everything, of course, being illustrated from the text of the author. For this purpose there is no better guide than Homer to introduce our neophytes to the possibilities of Greek literature, just as he led the schoolboy of ancient Hellas to the Pierian Spring.

The reasons which make Homer so desirable are apparent when once the question is seriously considered. His work is homogeneous in vocabulary, in literary style and idioms employed, and in metrical form, so that when students once get a fair start in him, further progress becomes easier and more accelerated. He employs all three persons, with all modes and tenses of the verb, so that all forms that are learned are used enough to be kept fresh in the student's mind and do not have to be learned again when he begins anything which is in dialogue form. His vocabulary is fairly limited, enough so in fact that it does not present any special difficulty to the beginner. His sentences are short, simple, and clear-cut, having none of the involved structure which makes so much of Xenophon really too difficult for first-year work. The verse, which has been considered a bar, is an actual help, as it is quite easily learned and is a marked aid in memorizing considerable portions of Greek, which is important at this stage. Furthermore, the rules of quantity are a considerable help in simplifying and illustrating the principles of accent. As he uses only one type of verse, and that the simplest—the dactylic hexameter—the ordinary student usually becomes quite adept at reading this before the end of the first year's work. The fact that he employs a different dialect from that in which the great mass of Greek literature is written, and the further fact that some Homer is practically always included in any Greek course, is another reason why Homer should come first. Instead of changing from Attic to Homeric Greek, and then from Homeric back to Attic, as at present, the student should begin with Homer and read all the Homeric Greek that is to be given him, and should then change to the Attic, since the difference between this and the Homeric is soon learned from any standard grammar. This involves a real saving and avoids a great deal of unnecessary confusion due to the present system. As the Homeric

forms are earlier, a knowledge of them helps to explain many things in Attic which would be unintelligible otherwise. It is now generally recognized that it takes some two or three years at the least for the student to obtain anything like a mastery of Greek grammar. If we introduce him to the subject through the medium of Homer and give him all or most of his later work in Attic Greek, with some attention paid to the historical development of the language, he will obtain a better and a clearer grasp of his Attic forms and Greek grammar in general than under the present system, which involves so much change forward and backward. Homer uses so few contracted forms that the whole subject of contraction can be profitably postponed until Attic Greek is reached, thus materially lightening the work of the student where help is most needed. While it is true that Homer employs a variety of forms, particularly in the personal pronouns and in the verb *εἰμί*, there is no necessity of learning more than the ordinary number of these, taking the most regular ones for this purpose, while the variants may be grouped in some convenient way for reference, and need not be memorized, as they are given in their proper alphabetical place in the vocabulary of any good school edition of Homer. The prose composition for the first year's work may be based upon Homer, the students using Homeric forms and constructions, without knowing of the existence of any other kind. This may be done without the slightest fear of blunting their sense of discrimination between poetic and prose diction and style, a sense which cannot possibly be developed until they have had several years' work and have read a considerable amount of Greek in both prose and poetry. Homer is so straightforward and simple in what he has to say, with nothing obscure, mystical, or far-fetched in any way, that he is quite intelligible to an average high-school Freshman, and at the same time he possesses the qualities of high literary art in such marked degree that he appeals strongly to the oldest and most advanced members of any college class. And, most of all, to nine-tenths of those who take Greek, Homer is intrinsically interesting and worth while in a way that could never be predicated of Xenophon. Most students even now find him fascinating, in spite of the many obstacles thrown in their way as they approach him, and in spite of the fact that

many of them have acquired a real distaste for Greek, developed all too often by our present system of routing all our classes via Xenophon.

Furthermore, Homer is the best possible preparation for all later Greek literature, much of which is unintelligible without a fair knowledge of him. He was to Greek literature what the Bible has been to English, and a great deal more as well. He leads us somewhere, not merely into a blind alley as does Xenophon, both with reference to later Greek literature and to much of the best in later European literature as well, where his influence has been incalculable and perhaps greater than that of any other single writer. In him are the germs of so many things. We have the narrative highly developed, the beginning of the drama, oratory, statecraft, seamanship, war, adventure, and religion—in fact, life as it was to the old Greeks in its manifold aspects.

Then the student who has taken only a very little of beginning Greek, even if he has progressed no farther than the end of the first book of the *Iliad*, has come into vital contact with the magic and the music of the Greek language, used in one of the most beautiful, one of the most varied, and one of the most influential literary compositions of all ages; and, though he may have devoted considerable labor to mining the gold, he cannot truthfully say, and probably will not want to say, that Greek for him has been a waste of time.

With a course in Greek as indicated above the student easily covers the first book of the *Iliad* in the time now usually allotted to the beginner's book. He has learned his forms and his syntax quite as well, without having to take any lessons requiring an exorbitant amount of time in their preparation, and is prepared to continue his work with assurance and profit. After some further work in Homer should come preferably some of the easier of the Greek tragedies, such as the *Hecuba*, the *Alcestis*, or the *Medea* of Euripides, all of which have been issued in convenient editions with vocabularies. The passage from Homer to the tragedians is comparatively easy, as they have so much in common both in vocabulary and ideas, and in many cases presuppose pretty much the same type of background. When a suitable amount of the tragedians has been read, some of the easier dialogues of Plato or some

of the better things of Lucian should be taken up. Later the course could be adapted to the conditions and needs facing the teacher in any particular locality. Many would perhaps wish to go into New Testament Greek immediately after Homer, while others would prefer to read some Herodotus at this point. Of course Herodotus is not at all difficult for those who have had any considerable amount of Homeric Greek, as he forms an easy and natural bridge from epic poetry to Attic prose.

Perhaps it is not amiss to indicate here that such a course in beginning Greek as outlined above, using Homer instead of Xenophon as a basis, and arranging the opening lessons in such a way that students soon begin the reading of a connected text instead of having nothing but detached sentences for long months, as heretofore, is not a matter of pure theory. The writer has been using such a system for beginning work, in mimeograph form, for the past four years, and it has met with such instant and hearty response from his students that he has become thoroughly convinced, not only of its practicability, but of its great desirability for first-year work. At the beginning of the experiment, in the autumn of 1913, the writer had what he considered a fair class in beginning Greek, numbering something like twenty members. For the beginning class of the following year over fifty students enrolled, the next year seventy-three, while the past year saw one hundred and six students ready to begin work which would lead so soon and so directly to something which was, not a composition to be heard and forgotten, but one to be ranked with those to which may be applied Thucydides' proud characterization of his own work as a *κτῆμα ἐσ ἀεί*.

Notes

[Contributions in the form of notes or discussions should be sent to John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.]

THE ENVY OF THE GODS IN HOMER

SECOND NOTE

In a previous number of this *Journal* (X, 181) I called attention to the fallacy in the theory advanced by J. A. K. Thompson in his *Studies in the "Odyssey,"* written under the supervision and in the spirit of Professor Gilbert Murray, in which he argued that Homer had no trace of "The envy of the gods," "Homer will have nothing to say of so crude a doctrine" (p. 11). In the previous note I quoted three passages from the *Odyssey* where there could be little doubt that the gods were plainly described as being jealous of human success or human happiness.

I wish to add another passage where it is possible to quote the interpretation of Greeks, so that the charge cannot be brought that the meaning has been forced to a different sense from that which it would have had in the minds of those who spoke the language.

P. 71: ἐνθα κε ρέα φίροι κλυντὰ τεύχεα Πανθοΐδαο
 Ἄτρεψης, εἰ μή οἱ δγάσσωτο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων,

to which the scholiast makes this comment, τὸ δγάσσωτο νῦν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐφθόνησεν, οὐν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐθαίμαστεν.

Eustathius also has the following note, δγάσσωτο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων, ὃ ἔστιν ἐφθόνησε.

In the *Paraphrasis*, or the interpretation of the poetry of Homer by the prose of ordinary Greek, we have this rendering of the passage, τότε ἀν ρρδίως ἀπηγέγκατο τὰ περικαλλῆ ὅπλα τοῦ Πάνθον, εἰ μὴ αὐτῷ ἐφθόνησεν ὃ Ἀπόλλων.

The unfathomed injury done to the study of Greek by Wolf and all his followers consists chiefly in this, that they regard a theory of more importance than facts, for if they can only spin a theory they have no need of facts.

I once asked a public reader, who prided himself on his comprehension of Shakespeare, the meaning of a certain passage in one of the minor plays of Shakespeare, a play which he had clearly never read, but he immediately arose to the emergency by saying, "I do not need to read Shakespeare in order to know him, for I have his spirit, I see things as he saw them, I feel things as he felt them." This assumption that a theory of Homeric composition relieves its holder from the obligation of having a decent knowledge of the poetry itself is a severer blow at classical scholarship than any yet delivered or likely to be delivered by Flexner and his followers.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

LINCOLN AND GORGIAS AGAIN

Professor Smiley's interesting remarks upon Lincoln and Gorgias will perhaps admit of a slight supplement. The sources of his style and the form of his thought are plainly to be found in his early reading. He knew the Bible well and the Bible abounds in precisely those figures to which Professor Smiley calls attention. The most colossal example of anaphora is to be found in the fifth chapter of Matthew, where no fewer than nine verses begin in the same way. Next to the Sermon on the Mount come the Psalms, where instances may be had on every page. The letter to Horace Greeley shows the manifest influence of legal language which did much to make his statements clear and his meaning unmistakable. It may be noted that he likes the dilemma, which is especially legal. In a similar way one can find the source of the Lincoln stories in Aesop, whom he read eagerly. Take for examples the Blondin and Jack Chase stories in the same Everyman's volume, which are essentially fables. Lincoln is the American Aesop, and here we really have a Greek source. I of course agree that Lincoln was not unconscious of the existence of an art of speech, but cannot admit "the divine intuition." He employs the figures he found in his slender reading and is lacking in those which are not to be found there.

N. W. DEWITT

VICTORIA COLLEGE
TORONTO

MR. ELMORE'S THREE PASSAGES OF TACITUS' *AGRICOLA*

Cap. 19. 4: "Namque per ludibrium adsidere clausis horreis et emere ultro frumenta ac ludere pretio cogebantur."

It is a mistake to think that *ludere* is either impossible or difficult. The crowning hardship was that "they were compelled to gamble with the money which they had brought to buy grain." Roman soldiers were notorious gamblers and easily fleeced the natives. The trick is not old. Only last month a Belgian gentleman told me of a well-to-do citizen of Brussels who was compelled by a German to play cards for money, a polite way of taking it from him. Of course the Roman soldier was an adept with the dice.

Cap. 30. 4: "Nos terrarum ac libertatis extremos recessus ipse ac sinus famae in hunc diem defendit; atque omne ignotum pro magnifico est."

A very common meaning of *sinus* is "fold" or "pocket" and it has a belittling sense. Thus *omnis propior sinus tenebatur* can only mean "every nook and corner to the south was in our possession." So *sinus imperii* means "a cranny of the empire." Not one example quoted will bear the translation "peninsula." Jutland is "a corner" inhabited by a *parva civitas*. We should translate "Only our situation at the edge of the world and of liberty and the meagerness of information has been our defense to this day; and anything unknown possesses a glamor."

Cap. 31. 5: "Nos integri et indomiti et in libertatem, non in paenitentiam laturi . . . ostendamus, quos sibi Caledonia viros seposuerit."

This passage can be interpreted easily as it stands, but it must be recognized that it is sheer poetry imitated chiefly from the first book of the *Aeneid* (ll. 39 ff.). The difficulty with *laturi* lies in the failure to observe that it bears the meaning of *fert* in the phrase *natura fert*, "has a tendency in a certain direction." Translate "prone by nature to liberty and not to submission." Of course this is a singularly pregnant use of the participle and pardonable only in a poetic passage. The use of *fero* is evidenced for Tacitus at the end of the last section in Harper *s.v.*, which, by the way, is a shocking jumble.

N. W. DEWITT

VICTORIA COLLEGE
TORONTO

QUOTATIONS FROM THE BIBLE IN ROMAN LITERATURE

In Mr. Max Radin's able article on "Roman Knowledge of Jewish Literature," in the December number of the *Classical Journal*, I find this statement: "Only once does a Roman specifically show that such a book as the Bible exists." Mr. Radin then quotes from the *περὶ θύσεως* of the Pseudo-Longinus § 9, 9: *ταύτη καὶ ὁ τῶν Ιουδαίων θερμοθέτης, οὐχ ὁ τυχῶν διήρ, ἐπειδὴ τὴν τοῦ θείου δύναμιν κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἔχωρησε κάκέφηνεν, εἰδὼς ἐν τῇ εἰσβολῇ γράψας τῶν νόμων, "εἶπεν ὁ Θεός," φησί· τί; "γενέσθω φῶς καὶ ἐγένετο · γενέσθω γῆ καὶ ἐγένετο."*

May I offer another quotation from the Old Testament (Exod. 3: 5) which I found imbedded in the writings of a somewhat more obscure Roman. It is in a treatise *περὶ τῶν λόγου σχημάτων* (Spengel 3, 145, 6 f.). The anonymous author of this treatise mentions Hermogenes and other writers of the second century A.D. He dedicates his work with the memorable phrase *φιλοποιώτατον τέκνον καὶ εὐλαβέστατε Ἰγνάτιον* and says that he is expecting divine assistance in his undertaking. In the body of the treatise (134, 28) he quotes ὁ θεολόγος. He concludes his treatise with: *Τέλος · τῷ θεῷ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας Ἀμήν.* The quotation from Exod. 3: 5, is *λῦσον τὸ ὑπόδημα ἐκ τῶν ποδῶν σου · ὁ γὰρ τόπος ἐν φύσει ἐστηκας γῆ ἀγία ἐστί.*

CHARLES N. SMILEY

GRINNELL COLLEGE

General Comment

[Edited by Gilbert Campbell Scoggin, The University of Missouri.]

Professor Chandler R. Post, of the departments of Greek and fine arts at Harvard University, is on leave of absence for the year, and with the rank of captain is military attaché of the American Embassy in Rome.

Professor George Willis Botsford, of Columbia University, died suddenly on December 13. He was a graduate of the University of Nebraska and held his doctorate from Cornell University. He taught Greek and Roman history at Harvard from 1895 to 1901 and then went to Columbia. He was the author of several books in his chosen field. His textbooks on Greek and Roman history have been widely used in secondary schools and colleges.

One of the finest private libraries in existence belongs to Mr. Henry E. Huntington, of New York. Among duplicates from this library, sold at the Anderson Galleries on December 10 and 11, was a very fine copy of Cicero's *Cato Major, or His Discourse of Old-Age: With Explanatory Notes*. This book, translated by James Logan, was published by Benjamin Franklin at Philadelphia in 1744, and is of considerable rarity. This particular copy, originally in the collection of George Brinley of Hartford, Connecticut, was sold along with no fewer than three other copies at the dispersal of the rarities of that bibliomaniacal gourmand; and at that time, almost forty years ago, it fetched two hundred and sixty dollars. What the recent figure was, I have not had the heart to inquire. I remember seeing a copy of this book in Manchester, England, when, after having been ruthlessly harassed as a probable German spy in the autumn of 1914, I fled to the smoky city and sought refuge in the precincts of the John Rylands Library. There through the kindness of the keeper I was shown the treasures of that matchless collection of classical books made famous by Dibden; and with special pride this rare American classical volume was laid before me.

Dr. Richard Mott Gummere, associate professor of Latin in Haverford College, has been appointed headmaster of the Penn Charter School in Philadelphia. Professor Gummere was graduated at Haverford in 1902 and he received his Ph.D. from Harvard in 1907. He will take up his new duties at the close of the present academic year. The salvation of education in America at the present time rests largely in the power of our secondary schools. At an

earlier period the colleges by maintaining rigid entrance requirements insured good preparation for serious college work, and the student knew well some few things. But of late the higher institutions of learning have proved recreant to their trust and have opened their doors to all alike who can present testimony that they have a certain number of "units" to their credit. What the individual "units" are seems to be of less importance than the numerical total. The colleges themselves are aware of the situation but hesitate to practice exclusion. But it is a hopeful sign of discontent that appears in President Butler's report wherein he ventures to suggest that it may be necessary to introduce at Columbia a rigid selective draft in connection with candidates for admission. Not long since I heard of a rather disconcerting case which reflects an unfortunate tendency in secondary education. It was related to me by the father of the boy in question. This boy, a member of a family of strong literary predilections, was attending a large and famous eastern preparatory school. He had the habit (unheard of there, it would seem) of carrying about in his pocket a small volume of English verse. One day he was called aside by one of the most influential masters of the school. "Come now," said this supervisor of instruction for youth, "you must cut this out. It won't go here." This same school had inherited a practice of awarding prizes for distinction in studies. The same boy was awarded a literary prize that had been specially selected by the headmaster. It was a cheaply bound copy of some recent work by a very insignificant writer. This boy of taste rightly cast the book from him on reaching his room. I could not help contrasting with this a thing that had come to my notice some time before. I had taken lodgings in a small English town. When I was shown to my room, the first thing that caught my eye was a small shelf of attractively bound books. The landlady quickly explained that these were prizes that her boy had earned in the local school. From among these carefully chosen books I now recall only Goldsmith and Addison, but, one and all, they were permanent treasures, in content and in form. The owner of these books was not destined for college but he had been given considerable insight into the best in literature. This, I take it, is no small part of a school's function. It is certainly a thing of good omen to see a man pass from a college chair in order to direct the destinies of a preparatory school. In other countries some of the best-known scholars have given their energies to directing the education of boys. The results have always been advantageous to school and college alike.

Reader, if thou beest an honest scholar and a true lover of learning, thou hast perused the selection from the library of an American Philologist which, I trow, now lieth to hand on thy desk. There wilt thou find many an item that may tug violently at thy purse strings, but this should cause no blush of shame to suffuse thy cheeks. Ponderous folios in vellum, chubby quartos in old calf, and a numerous brood of smaller size but of no less dignity there await thy

pleasure. Scorn not the ancient lexicon of Ceratinus (No. 70) or that of Calepinus (No. 111) with the poor excuse that they are no longer "auf der Höhe." What classical lexicon is? Thou knowest from experience that the combined forces of Generals Liddell and Scott, even when closely followed by the forlorn hope of Van Herwerden, will scarcely enable thee to storm even the small fortresses of Solmsen and of Buck. Of course for a good old-fashioned heroic combat thou mayest still rely upon "the old guard" of Stephanus (No. 87), but if thou wouldest assail the redoubtable *CIG*, thou knowest that thou canst no longer rely upon that massed formation in the open; now thou must needs resort to trench warfare, which, if less showy, possibly requires greater patience and endurance. Thou art forced to make thy way slowly along devious paths that lead far from the light of day under cover of learned periodicals and occasional dissertations. An adequate Greek dictionary is more a matter of desire than even of remotest hope; and two of the greatest Grecians of our age, Richard Jebb and Ingram Bywater, could not agree even on the question of general plan for such a work, as thou canst see if thou wilt turn to the recent *Memoir* of the Oxford scholar (p. 122). So then "suspend not from thy nose" that venerable pair, Ceratinus and Calepinus. These very copies from the library of the American Philologist no doubt have assisted some honored "clerk" to a fuller appreciation of the beauties of the ancients. Everyone who hath a true love for letters will gladly give space on his shelves to a copy of the lexicon of Pasor. A copy of this book had an honorable place among the presses of that most human of men, Mr. Samuel Pepys, as he himself informs us; and that very copy may be seen to this day along with other volumes equally interesting, if the charmed stroller along the Cambridge "backs" will turn aside into the retired garden of Magdalene College. What though Lord Monboddo in his six volumes (the seventh never appeared!) *Of the Origin and Progress of Language* (No. 37) fails to stress that later doctrine of the *Junggrammatiker* with all their insistence, in season and out of season, upon the tyrannous rule of Sound Change and his faithful spouse Analogy? Perhaps the world had grown weary of that age-long struggle between the "analogists" and the "anomalists" which had been going on at least since the days of Aristarchus and his formidable rival, Crates of Mallos. In its stead, to thy relief, thou wilt find entertaining reading about tailed men and other such things so necessary to a proper understanding of our species. Though thou findest little there to anticipate the doctrine of Leskien, Brugmann, Osthoff, and Paul, verily shalt thou find a considerable foreshadowing of the teaching of Darwin. Thou shouldest remember withal that the distinguished physician of Henry the Eighth, Dr. Andrew Board, in his introduction to Scogin's *Jests* (full of witty mirth and pleasant shifts), hath reminded his readers that "there is nothing beside the goodness of God, that preserves health so much as honest mirth used at dinner and supper, and mirth towards bed." Although thou beest an expert etymologist and one well trained in the history of words, and accustomed to consult such masterly works as the

Oxford Dictionary and the *St. Petersburg Lexicon* (which last still stands unrivaled in the field of lexicography), thou wilt all the more find interest in Edward Phillips' *New World of Words* (No. 40). Naturally enough this work will contain little scientific philology, but it is chock full of human nature and its foibles; and an acquaintance with its origin and history will bring thee indirectly into contact with that great man, John Milton. Then, too, if thou hast sporting blood in thy veins, thou shalt have staged before thee a very pretty literary quarrel, well-nigh surpassing the one which thou hast witnessed in thine own day under the auspices of those great scholars, Whitney and Max Müller. Many pleasant by-paths will open before thee, and perchance thou mayest take the one leading to that great storehouse of literary lore, old Anthony à Wood's *Athenae Oxonienses* (my favorite edition of which was edited by Philip Bliss in the year 1813, four volumes folio, weighing each, on imperial paper, nigh on to two stone). Turning to volume four, page 659, of this mastodon among books, and reading what is there indited about the said Phillips, thou canst not wonder that Anthony, in spite of his remarkable fearlessness, had planned that a new edition would be more safely printed in Holland; nor will it seem strange that on his deathbed he doubted that his executor would have the courage to print it anywhere. These few books, reader, gathered at random from this catalogue, all played a very important part in the scholarship of their day and have contributed no little to the world's store of knowledge. For this reason alone, if for no other, they deserve an honored place on the shelves of the scholar's study, and are not to be consigned to his attic or his cellar. Buy Liberty Bonds, for if thou beest a true scholar thou must also be a loyal patriot. The insurance of future peace is so necessary for the work of the scholar and for the preservation of the fruits of his work, as is so piteously testified by the sad fate of Louvain. But with all thy buying, buy books also, for these are the channels whereby learning is transmitted to future generations of scholars. If thou doest thy duty herein, thou mayest be assured that at some future time there will arise a grateful soul who will call thee blessed. Thou wilt remember how the sainted Jerome hath said, "The same man cannot love both gold and books." And that prince of book-lovers, Richard de Bury, hath insisted that "no dearness of price ought to hinder a man from the buying of books if he has the money that is demanded for them." "If he has the money"—ah, there's the rub. If thou canst not buy both bonds and books, then being the true patriot that thou art, thou wilt buy a—but stay, reader, be not rash and overhasty. Why not have recourse to the *Sortes Virgilianae*? The gentle Virgil was a scholar and a lover of books. Who knows but that his sympathetic spirit may influence a result which thy conscience would not have allowed thee to choose of thine own free will?

Book Reviews

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Vol. XXVIII. Cambridge: University Press. Pp. 236. \$1.50 net.

The contents of this volume are as follows: "On the Second Book of Aristotle's *Poetics* and the Source of Theophrastus' Definition of Tragedy," by A. Philip McMahon; "Chaucer's *Lollius*," by George Lyman Kittredge; "A Study of Exposition in Greek Tragedy," by Evelyn Spring; and "Summaries of Dissertations for the Degree of Ph.D., 1916-17."

The materials in Dr. McMahon's article, as he tells us, formed part of a dissertation, "The Mediaeval Conception of Comedy and Tragedy," which was submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Ph.D. at Harvard University. The paper as we have it in the *Harvard Studies* is intended to discredit the generally accepted view of the original existence of a "Second Book of the *Poetics*." In his desire to be fair to the traditional doctrine, the author nearly bends over backward. In the first main section of his paper, entitled "The Tradition of a Lost Second Book of the *Poetics*," there is nothing to suggest that this theory is not accepted by the author himself. In fact there is at least one intimation that this represents the author's own point of view; for, on page 2, at the beginning of subsection 2, we find these words, "Although the direct assertions of the existence of two books are comparatively few, many statements indicate that there were more than one."

In the first main section Dr. McMahon gives, with judicial fairness, the arguments in favor of the traditional view, the statements of Diogenes Laertius and of the so-called Anonymus Menagii that there were two books, and the testimony to the same effect of the index of Aristotle's works in the "fragments of a philosopher of Ptolemy's reign"; the many references in the works of Aristotle himself, where the definite article is always used in the plural when reference is made to the *Poetics*; the unfulfilled pledge in the *Poetics*, where Aristotle says that "we shall speak later about Comedy"; other references to subjects that may well have been treated in this lost second book; and the origin and growth of the theory of the lost book.

In the second principal section Dr. McMahon criticizes the tradition of a second book. He argues that the indexes cannot be trusted; that there are references that point to the existence of only a single book; that the second book was lacking in the common archetype of Σ and in our oldest Greek manuscript; that the existence of this book was unknown to later grammarians; that the story of the cave at Skepsis is dubious; that the cross-references in Aristotle's works are, at least in the main, post-Aristotelian and are untrustworthy;

that Aristotle's promises to treat a matter more fully "guarantees not fulfilment but only intention"; that his statement that "we shall speak later about Comedy" may not have been in the original text.

The third principal section is "The Dialogues of Aristotle." Dr. McMahon is concerned not so much with the general subject of the dialogues of Aristotle as with the possible connection between the work *On Poets* and the *Poetics*. He accepts the testimony to the effect that the work *On Poets* was a dialogue and was in three books. The hypothesis, he says, "that many of the references to matters poetic which are not found in the *Poetics* might have been in the work *On Poets*" "is surely as valid and reasonable on its face as the theory that such matters were to be found in a second book of the *Poetics*."

In a fourth section of less than four pages, entitled "Theophrastus," Dr. McMahon suggests that, inasmuch as Theophrastus was so loyal a disciple of Aristotle, he probably did not differ much from his master on matters poetic and dramatic, and that "fragments of Theophrastus on the question of comedy and tragedy, therefore, not found in our *Poetics*, might well have been in Aristotle's dialogue *On Poets*."

Dr. McMahon has really stated the difficulties of his thesis when he says (p. 9), "The existence of a second book, assumed to be lost, cannot, in the nature of the case, be absolutely disproved. By the logic of such a situation a universal negative cannot be absolutely proved even of contemporary facts." He has presented all of his facts in a clear and forceful way. He has been manifestly fair to the traditional view. The greatest stumbling-block to his theory—and one that it seems to me he does not remove at all—lies in the promise of Aristotle in the *Poetics* itself, "we shall speak later about the poetry which imitates in hexameter verse and about Comedy." Later Aristotle speaks of epic poetry at some length; but he does not take up the subject of comedy. The statement of Dr. McMahon that the words "we shall speak later about Comedy" may not have been in the original text, does not meet the situation. In the first place, the words as they are found in Aristotle seem natural. More important, however, is the fact that, regardless of whether Aristotle made a promise here or not, his work on *Poetics*, especially when it deals at some length with the tragedy, demands for its completeness, and for the satisfaction of the natural pride and honesty of its author, that an account of comedy be included. If this subject was not included in a second book, then we must suppose that it was treated somewhere in the first book and has fallen out from the text. So, the reviewer, while commanding the thesis for its manifold excellencies, finds himself unable to subscribe to the conclusion of the author, "All the conditions of the problem are more completely satisfied, on the basis of existing evidence, by the hypothesis that there was no second book of the *Poetics*."

The second article is by George Lyman Kittredge on "Chaucer's *Lollius*." The reviewer has one advantage in taking up this part of the volume. He can read and write without the prejudice that often comes from knowledge or

partial knowledge. The problem of Lollius was unknown to him. He has no hesitation in saying that the author of the article not only proves the provable but seems to solve the insoluble. The author shows that the problem of Lollius has become a mystery largely through the treatment of scholars themselves. In *The House of Fame* Lollius is included in a group of "six worthies who 'bear up' the fame of Troy: these are Homer, Dares, and Dictys, Lollius, Guido delle Colonne, and Geoffrey of Monmouth." It is evident, therefore, that to Chaucer Lollius was as much a real personage as those with whose name his is associated; and that, moreover, Chaucer had good reason to suppose—or thought that he had—that Lollius wrote about Troy. When Chaucer wrote the novel *Troilus*, he followed the expedient of referring to ancient authority as source for his material. He explicitly adopted the definite Lollius, and claimed to be translating from his Latin work. To Lollius Chaucer was indebted—so he wished his readers to believe—for everything in this tale, whether he was borrowing from Boccaccio, Benoit, Guido, Statius, Ovid, or Boethius, or giving details of his own invention. This device was not intended to deceive anybody. Probably his intimate friends, to whom he dedicated the work, John Gower and Ralph Strode, understood this fact at the time. At any rate, Lydgate, a generation later, shows that it was well known that the real source of the *Troilus* was a book in the Italian language, i.e., Boccaccio's *Filostrato*.

With this much proved, arises the question, Where did Chaucer come across the information that Lollius wrote an important work on Troy? Professor Kittredge adopts the view proposed by Latham in 1868 that the mistake of Chaucer's, whether it originated with him or not, sprang from a misunderstanding of the beginning of the second epistle of the first book of Horace. These verses are:

Troiani belli scriptorem, Maxime Lolli,
Dum tu declamas Romae, Praeneste relegi.

If *scriptor* or *scriptorum* had stood in the text read by Chaucer, or even if he had the common text but understood *scriptorem* to be the object of *declamas* as well as of *relegi*, the reader—Chaucer or someone else—might easily have drawn the inference that Lollius was a writer of Trojan matters. Other bits of testimony, such as a scholium of the pseudo-Acron on an ode of Horace dedicated to another Lollius, may have helped to perpetuate the error. Professor Kittredge closes the main part of the paper by reference to some of the palpable blunders made by scholars in dealing with this problem of Lollius. He disarms criticism—if any were in sight—by this bit of naïve confession which suggests the dilemma in which he would place the critic. It is too good not to quote in full:

My brief review has been undertaken in a spirit of humility, not of censoriousness. Indeed, the very name of Lollius seems to have acted as a spell. A deceptive glamour attends it. Hardly anybody has approached the charmed circle without losing his way and wandering about, pixy-led, mistaking bushes for bears. I can claim no exemption from the ban, and feel little doubt that I have blundered somewhere.

Several bad mistakes, indeed, I have already cut out of my manuscript. Others, I trust, remain to help in establishing the proposition that I am endeavoring to prove—to wit, the proposition that a mediaeval error in dealing with the Horatian passage is very probable.

There are three appendixes to this article, each of which is a thesis in itself. The first is entitled "On Chaucer's References to His Sources in the Troilus." In this part Professor Kittredge notes more than forty passages in which there are references or allusions to "myn auctor," i.e., Lollius. Many of these he discusses at some length.

In Appendix II he takes up the subject of the "Use of the Teseide in the Troilus." In Appendix III, entitled "The Teseide and the Thebaid," he gives all of the passages in the poem of Boccaccio that parallel passages in the "Thebaid" of Statius.

The article is a most interesting one to the student of classics, to the student of Old English, and to every scholar who likes to see a beautiful piece of exposition set forth by a master.

The third number in the volume is "A Study of Exposition in Greek Tragedy," by Dr. Evelyn Spring. She tells us that "this essay in its original form, entitled *Quo Modo Aeschylus in Tragoediis Suis Res Antecedentis Exposuerit*, was presented in 1915 in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Radcliffe College." Dr. Spring first takes up the subject "Exposition in the Trilogy." She shows that in the first two plays of the *Oresteia* Aeschylus made definite arrangements for the succeeding play, summarizing in the case of the Agamemnon and giving frequent references in the *Choephoroe*; that, furthermore, the last two plays of the trilogy contain allusions to the previous play or plays; but that, in spite of these references forward and backward, each of the plays is an "intelligible dramatic entity." She then takes up briefly the plots of the other extant plays of Aeschylus and of some of the lost plays, and arrives at this decision: "The conclusions, therefore, drawn in regard to the interrelation of the plays of the *Oresteia*, are confirmed rather than contradicted by an examination of other connected groups."

Dr. Spring then comes to the second division of her paper, "Exposition in the Separate Plays." This subject is treated under various heads. In "Exposition in the Parodos or Prologue" she shows, in the case of Aeschylus, that the poet gave in this part of the play all of the information that the audience needed, "provided it is admitted that the poet presupposed for his audience a general knowledge of the myths that he used as foundation for his plots." In the section entitled "The Repetition of Expository Details after the Parodos or Prologue" Dr. Spring explains that for various reasons, primarily that the *dramatis personae* and the chorus may be made acquainted with facts and situations already disclosed to the audience, there is a repetition of most of the information contained in the Parodos and the Prologue, and that, while this is especially true in the dramas of Euripides, the practice is found also in the plays of Sophocles and of Aeschylus. In the next section, "The Gradual

"Exposition of the Past," the author shows that while "Euripides rarely resorted to gradual elucidation," Sophocles adopted this method somewhat and Aeschylus "more conspicuously." In the section headed "The Forms of Exposition" Dr. Spring explains the part played in the tragedy, especially in the case of Aeschylus, by exposition in lyric form, in narrative or dialogue form, and in dramatic form. The last section is entitled "The Selection of Expository Details." The contention of the writer in this section is primarily that Aeschylus intentionally omitted many details of past events and that "he chose to emphasize only those facts of the past which would tend to make his plays, as a whole, most successful from a dramatic point of view"; and that he so manipulated "the exposition as to give a problematical aspect to the events of the past." In her "Conclusion," therefore, in speaking of "the special problems in exposition that these dramatists had to face," Dr. Spring comes to this decision, that "of the three, Aeschylus was the greatest master of dramatic exposition."

In this article Dr. Spring shows evidence of wide reading and makes a careful analysis of many plays. It is manifest from the title of her thesis, from which this paper is drawn, that it is Aeschylus, and not the three great dramatists, that she is primarily studying. In fact, she makes this admission (p. 137): "I shall emphasize, accordingly, throughout the paper this aspect [i.e., of construction] of Aeschylus' dramatic genius and discuss his plays in greater detail than those of Sophocles or Euripides." In view of these facts, it would seem as if the title might more appropriately have been "A Study of Exposition in Greek Tragedy, with Special Reference to Aeschylus."

At the end of the *Studies* are short "Summaries of Dissertations for the Degree of Ph.D., 1916-17," as follows: "De Vicis Atticis," by Robert Vincent Cram; "Quid de Poetis Plato censuerit," by William C. Greene; and "Quo modo Tragici Graeci res naturales tractaverint."

GEORGE EDWIN HOWES

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

The Religious Thought of the Greeks. From Homer to the Triumph of Christianity. By CLIFFORD HERSCHEL MOORE. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1916.

In this volume Professor Moore has given us an admirable sketch of the chief factors in Greek and Greco-Roman religious experience from the primitive era of Homer to the end of Roman paganism. To treat so long a period, with its multitude of cults, its infinite details of ritual, and its conflicts of philosophic theories, and yet to preserve throughout a true sense of proportion was a difficult task. At almost any point a less wary writer might have been beguiled from the highway into bypaths of religious or philosophical discussion, from which both he and his readers would have emerged with possibly considerable information in regard to details but with a seriously impaired view of

the relative importance of the manifold influences at work in the successive stages of Greek and Roman religion. But Professor Moore knows both the Greek and the Roman side well, and no one can read the volume without gaining a keener appreciation of what constitutes the essential and nonessential in religious history. We are brought to a vivid realization of the fact that in the midst of what seems to the superficial observer nothing more than a medley of beliefs there was a steady, persistent onward drive of certain moral and religious ideas that finally found a satisfactory medium of expression in the Christian faith. Herein lies the chief merit of the work. It gives us, better than other books of the same compass known to the reviewer, a sense of the integrity and unity of the subject.

The scope of the volume may best be seen by a glance at the chapter titles: i, "Homer and Hesiod"; ii, "Orphism, Pythagoreanism and the Mysteries"; iii, "Religion in the Poets of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C.>"; iv, "The Fifth Century at Athens"; v, "Plato and Aristotle"; vi, "Later Religious Philosophies"; vii, "The Victory of Greece over Rome"; viii, "Oriental Religions in the Western Half of the Roman Empire"; ix, "Christianity"; x, "Christianity and Paganism." An appendix gives a good bibliography of selected titles. Only one typographical error has been noticed, Memmius for Mummius, p. 237.

Besides being useful to the general reader and to students of the classics as a whole, the book will be welcomed by professors giving courses in Greek and Roman religion, as they will find in several of the chapters suitable additions to their lists of assigned readings.

GORDON LAING

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

SENATORS AS JURORS—A CORRECTION

In the January issue of the *Classical Journal* I made an error in my review of Dr. Cowles's *Gaius Verres* which I desire to correct. For some reason, in a fit of carelessness or mental aberration, I confused the date of the orations of Cicero against Verres with the date of the enactment of the *Lex Cornelia de repetundis*. Owing to this confusion, I made the statement that senators were regularly the jurors in criminal trials ten years prior to the enactment of the *Lex Cornelia*. I should have said ten years prior to the time of the trial of Verres. The error I made did not invalidate my argument, but it was a very careless misstatement.

R. W. HUSBAND

Classical Association OF THE Middle West and South

Officers of the Association

President

CHARLES N. SMILEY
GRINNELL COLLEGE, GRINNELL, IOWA

First Vice-President

DANIEL A. PENICK
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN, TEXAS

Secretary-Treasurer

LOUIS E. LORD
OBERLIN COLLEGE, OBERLIN, OHIO

Vice-Presidents for the States

ALABAMA	HORTENSE THORNTON,	BIRMINGHAM
ARKANSAS	GUY A. SIMMONS,	CONWAY
COLORADO	CHARLES C. MIEROW,	COLORADO SPRINGS
FLORIDA	JOSIAH B. GAME,	TALLAHASSEE
GEORGIA	E. K. TURNER,	OXFORD
ILLINOIS	LOURA WOODRUFF	OAK PARK
INDIANA	FRANK H. COWLES,	CRAWFORDSBURG
IOWA	F. C. EASTMAN,	IOWA CITY
KANSAS	O. G. MARKHAM,	BALDWIN
KENTUCKY	M. A. LEIPER,	BOWLING GREEN
LOUISIANA	EDWARD A. BECHTEL,	NEW ORLEANS
MICHIGAN	CHEEVER HOYT,	DETROIT
MINNESOTA	ARTHUR L. KEITH,	NORTHFIELD
MISSISSIPPI	ALFRED W. MILDEN,	UNIVERSITY
MISSOURI	H. H. ARMSTRONG,	SPRINGFIELD
NEBRASKA	OLIVIA M. POUND,	LINCOLN
N. CAROLINA	HELEN H. LAW,	RALEIGH
N. DAKOTA	GUY R. VOWLES,	FARGO
NEW MEXICO	LYNN B. MITCHELL,	ALBUQUERQUE
OHIO	EDWIN L. FINDLEY,	CLEVELAND
OKLAHOMA	O. W. JEFFRIES,	EDMOND
S. CAROLINA	MINNIE A. GEE,	SPARTANBURG
S. DAKOTA	J. H. HOWARD,	VERMILION
TENNESSEE	DAVID R. LEE,	KNOXVILLE
TEXAS	DANIEL A. PENICK,	AUSTIN
UTAH	ALICE E. ROWE,	SALT LAKE CITY
VIRGINIA	HERBERT C. LIPSCOMB,	LYNCHBURG
WEST VIRGINIA	CHARLES E. BISHOP,	MORGANTOWN
WISCONSIN	LUCIA SPOONER,	SUPERIOR
WYOMING	IDA B. HULL,	SHERIDAN

Executive Committee

THE PRESIDENT, FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT, SECRETARY-TREASURER,
AND

WILLIAM G. HALE

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, CHICAGO, ILL.

FRANCIS W. KELSEY

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, ANN ARBOR, MICH.

A. L. BONDURANT

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI, UNIVERSITY, MISS.

J. B. PIKE

THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

The Classical Association of the Middle West and South

is organized for the purpose of encouraging the development of the study of the classics; to provide a means of intercommunication between teachers of the classics—whether in the secondary schools, in the colleges, or in the universities of the territory it covers; and generally to promote a unity of thought and action in the broad field of classical teaching. Membership in the Association is open to all teachers of the classics and to other individuals interested in classical studies who reside in the territory covered by the Association. The membership fee is \$2.00 per year; \$1.25 of this amount covers the subscription to the *Classical Journal*, which is a special rate, the regular subscription price being \$2.50 per year. The value of the *Journal*, which is the official publication of the Association, to those interested in the classics, either as students or as teachers, cannot be measured by the annual outlay. The advantages involved in this offer should therefore appeal strongly to those who find themselves in this class.

Application for membership in the Association should be made to the Vice-President of the state in which the applicant resides (see list on page three of cover), or to the Secretary-Treasurer of the Association.

A plan of co-operation has been perfected with the Classical Association of New England and the Classical Association of the Pacific States. See second cover-page for directions relating to applications for membership.

The next annual meeting of the Association will be held at Omaha, Nebraska, at the end of the first week in April, 1918.